

Imp. Hist.
Eno. Hist.
(Ireland)

Price—One Shilling.

(By Post 1s. 2d.)



THE

IRISH QUESTION!
UNION OR DISMEMBERMENT?



BY

H. B. SEALY.



SOLD BY ALL BOOKSELLERS.

With Mr. Sealy's compliments

THE

IRISH QUESTION:
UNION

OR

DISMEMBERMENT?



COMPILED FOR COLONIAL READERS FROM THE
MOST RELIABLE AUTHORITIES AVAILABLE,

By H. B. SEALY,

FORMERLY R.M. AT NAPIER, N.Z., AND COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS
FOR THE PROVINCE OF HAWKE'S BAY.

AUTHOR OF "A KEY TO THE STAMP ACTS" (N.Z.)



PRINTED FOR THE PROPRIETOR, H. B. SEALY, ST. GEORGE'S BAY ROAD,
AUCKLAND, BY WILSONS AND HORTON, QUEEN STREET.



SOLD BY ALL BOOKSELLERS IN NEW ZEALAND,
AND
GEORGE ROBERTSON AND CO., LIMITED, MELBOURNE AND SYDNEY.

AUCKLAND :

WILSONS AND HORTON, PRINTERS AND BINDERS, "HERALD" OFFICE,
QUEEN AND WYNDHAM STREETS.

MDCCCLXXXIX.

PREFACE.



TEN years ago colonists of Australasia, whether they hailed from England, Ireland, Scotland, or other parts of the British Empire, were allowed to pursue in peace the even tenor of their way; and their talk was of land and wool, of sheep, cattle, and horses, of wheat, oats, and other crops; but no question of nationality arose to trouble them, except perhaps in this Colony, when the Maoris began to grow more and more jealous of the increasing numbers and influence of the Pakehas who had come across the sea, and who were, slowly perhaps, but surely, pushing aside the race whom they found in possession. But now the order of things is changed, and emissaries are abroad to sow the apples of discord. "Ireland desires to take her place amongst the nations of the earth." The earth must stand still, in defiance of gravitation and other laws which regulate the motions of this planet. Ireland has not consented to those laws, and Ireland recognises no laws that do not emanate from a Dublin Parliament, or National League in Dublin.

It is perhaps a bold undertaking to write a treatise on the Irish question, that chronic difficulty which for centuries has been a thorn in the side of successive British Governments; sometimes breaking out in an acute form and requiring drastic medicaments to allay the fever, at other times lying dormant in the system for months or for years, and then, perhaps from unknown causes, breaking out suddenly in a violent epidemic form. We have no pills or ointment to offer with a promise of miraculous cure; we should as soon think of prescribing one of the fashionable quack curatives for the leprosy of the descendants of Gehazi. The most that medical skill can do is to diagnose the symptoms, and alleviate the sufferings of the patients. But when we look into the publications of the day, or the month, and note how utterly the experience of the past

is ignored, and how confidently some patent medicine is vaunted as a specific, we feel a natural desire to investigate the grounds upon which such assurance rests. The latest panacea which has gained credence with the populace is scientifically known as autonomy, but the vulgar name is Home Rule. A popular physician, who has been experimenting for twenty years or more, has brought this forward as a new discovery and an infallible cure. But it is no new discovery, for it was tried more than one hundred years ago, and was found to aggravate the symptoms so seriously that an antidote had to be promptly administered. This antidote was "The Union."

The task we have undertaken, then, is to analyze this professed specific, to investigate its effect in the past and the present, and to examine its claims for the future ; to look into the certificates of the modern medico who warrants it to work a perfect cure, provided the case is left entirely in his hands ; to investigate the causes of his failure in the past, and of his conversion, as by the wand of an enchanter, to the new *regime* which he had so long denounced.



BRIEF SKETCH

OF THE

EARLY HISTORY OF IRELAND.

THE land question, and the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, lie at the root of the Irish difficulty. It is not necessary to consider here at any length the legends or the history of Ireland, prior to the invasion by the Norman Barons in the twelfth century. In David Hume's history this outline of Irish history, prior to the invasion under King Henry II., is summarised in few words.

As Britain was first peopled from Gaul, so was Ireland probably from Britain. The Irish were converted to Christianity by St. Patrick about the middle of the fifth century; and as Ireland escaped the incursions of the barbarians who overran the rest of Europe, the ecclesiastics of that country had preserved a considerable share of learning when other nations were buried in ignorance. The Irish schools were resorted to by foreigners, and Irish missionaries spread their religion and their learning over the Continent of Europe. The invasion of the Danes and Northmen in the eighth century replunged Ireland into barbarism, from which however the towns which those invaders inhabited on the East coast were beginning to emerge. The small principalities into which they were divided exercised perpetual rapine and violence against each other; the uncertain succession of their princes was a continual source of domestic convulsions; the usual title of each petty sovereign was the murder of his predecessor; courage and force, though exercised in the commission of crimes, were more honoured than any pacific virtues; and the more simple arts of life, even tillage and agriculture, were almost wholly unknown among them. The inhabitants outside the towns exercised pasturage in the open country, sought protection from any danger in their forests and morasses, and being divided by the fiercest animosities against each other, were still more intent on the means of mutual injury than on the expedients for common, or even for private interest. Besides many small tribes, there were, in the age of Henry II., five principal sovereignties in the island, Munster, Leinster, Meath, Ulster, and Connaught; and as it had been usual for one or other of these to take the lead in their wars, there was commonly some prince, who seemed for the time to act as monarch of Ireland.

Nearly four centuries prior to the invasion under Henry II. "the Danes had made their first descent upon Ireland, and," as we learn from Mr. Justin McCarthy's "Outline of Irish History,"

Had for a time established themselves there, expending their fiercest fury upon the Church of the West, and driving the Irish scholars to carry their culture and their philosophy to the great cities of the European Continent. The Irish chiefs, divided among themselves, were unable to oppose a common front to the enemy, and for more than a century the sea-kings held Ireland in subjection. At length Brian Boroihme, brother to the King of Munster, raised an army and defeated the Danes in 968, and again crushingly in 1014. This great defeat put an end to any further dreams of Danish invasion of Ireland, though it did not by any means destroy the influence the Danes had already acquired in the island. They still held the great seaport towns, and carried on fierce feuds with the native tribes; and in time became absorbed into and united with them. The death of Brian had a disastrous effect upon the condition of Ireland. The provinces that he had subjugated reasserted their independence; but his usurpation had shattered the supremacy of the old royal race, and the history of Ireland, until the middle of the twelfth century, is merely a melancholy succession of civil wars and struggles for the Crown, upon which it would be alike painful and profitless to dwell.

The above extract from the work of a well-known Irish historian describes the condition of Ireland up to the very time that King Henry II. had obtained from Pope Adrian IV. a bull, authorising him "to invade Ireland in order to extirpate the vice and wickedness of the natives, and oblige them to pay yearly from every house a penny to the See of Rome." If we are to judge the actions of people in the twelfth century by the standard of morals in the nineteenth, we cannot commend this giving away, for a *quid pro quo*, of an island to which the donor had no title whatever. But if it was the correct thing in the twelfth century for Pope Adrian IV. to make a gift of Ireland to King Henry, how can it be also right for a section of the same Church, from Archbishops downwards, to teach their flocks to repudiate the bargain, now that the terms of it have been complied with on the English side, and their Church has obtained the stipulated benefit? Cardinal Moran, for instance, claims the restoration of Irish National Independence—that is to say, the rule of the descendants of the five Kings; and also of the Danes, who had a better title to what they held than Pope Adrian had to what he granted to the English King. The chief business of these five Irish kings and their clans was war and rapine amongst themselves, sometimes temporarily combining together for defence, or joining two or more of the clans for aggression. They had no settled industry, no settled habitations, and very vague conceptions of property. The Normans were specially qualified to take control of a warlike, turbulent, but at that time semi-savage people.

They did not destroy the Irish people, they took the government of them merely, as the English have done in India, dispossessing the chiefs, changing the loose order of inheritance into an orderly succession, giving security to life and property, and enabling those who cared

to be industrious to reap the fruits of their labours without fear of outrage and plunder. Their right to govern lay in their capability of governing, and in the need of the Irish to be governed. Celtic Ireland was neither Papal nor inclined to submit itself to the Papacy, till Henry II. rivetted the Roman yoke upon them . . . Nor did Ireland fail at the outset to profit by the presence of the Normans. For two centuries after their landing, large sections of the country were subdued into some kind of order and arrangement. The Celtic chiefs were driven into the mountains. Fitzgeralds, Lacies, DeBurghs, DeCourcies, Blakes, Butlers, took the places of McCarthies, O'Neills, O'Briens, O'Sullivan's, and O'Connors. Those of the old race who remained in the homes of their fathers were compelled to conform to some kind of rule . . . The work begun by the Danes was carried on and developed. Seaport towns—Dublin, Wexford, Cork, Waterford, Limerick—were enlarged, strengthened, surrounded with walls, and governed like English cities; trading ships went and came; outside the fortifications, and within the shelter of their garrisons, round Dublin especially, the country became settled and cultivated. Tenants took leases of land and raised houses on them; while in the interior, with incessant fighting and arduous police work, which knew neither end nor respite, the heads of the Norman families hammered the unwilling metal of the Celts into some consistency, and forced them into habits less extravagantly wild and confused. The four provinces were mapped out into districts; inland towns were raised, fortified, and provided with the forms at least of free municipal institutions; sheriffs and magistrates were chosen; and the Brehon traditions—a code of customs in which crime had become a word without meaning, and the most savage murders could be paid for with a cow or a sheep—began to yield before the English common law, and quiet industry recognised the need and value of protection. . . . The work was harder because—and it is the difficulty which has been at once the honour and perplexity of the English relations with Ireland from first to last—because the effort of the conquerors was to govern the Irish not as a vassal province but as a free nation; to extend the forms of English liberty—her trials by jury, her local Courts, her Parliaments—to a people essentially unfit for them; and while governing Ireland, to teach her, at the same time, the harder lesson to govern herself.*

It will no doubt have occurred to New Zealand readers that the foregoing outline of the state of Ireland prior to, and after the invasion of the twelfth century, has many points of resemblance to the state of Maoriland when we early colonists, and descendants of the same race who invaded England in the eleventh, and Ireland in the following century, arrived to occupy and govern this country. The most important difference between the two cases was that, in the case of Ireland, the invaders acted in accordance with ideas of right and wrong current in the twelfth century, whilst in Maoriland we acted in the brighter light of the nineteenth. There was another difference; we followed close on the heels of the missionaries, whilst the Maoris were under the influence of their teaching, and we did not repeat the error of the invaders of Ireland, by “riveting the Roman yoke upon them.” It is to

* See J. A. Froude's "English in Ireland," vol. I., pages 17-20.

be feared our Maori friends could not show a very clear title to their estates if judged by the standard of nineteenth century ethics, but it is quite a novel idea in conveyancing to carry back the investigation of titles for a period of seven hundred years, to say nothing of a grant from the Crown, with a Papal bull thrown in. The thing is really too absurd to be treated seriously; where would it end? Was the title of the Irish any better, or nearly as good as that of their conquerors? How did they become possessed? By purchase, by donation, by will? Surely some prior and better title must be shown before that of the present holders can be disputed. In this country, in those good old times which a learned Judge once described as prior to morality, an indefeasible title was frequently obtained by the simple process of killing and eating the predecessor in title. We are not aware that the Irish adopted this entire process in their mode of conveyancing; but are inclined to think they found a precedent of very old date wherein one, Jezebel by name, obtained an estate for her husband by what is known in modern Irish parlance as the "removal" of the predecessor; but in that case prompt possession of the land was regarded as essential to the validity of the title.

HOME RULE.

WHAT is this phantom, this Will-o'-the-wisp which is being perpetually dangled before our eyes, but which as soon as we try to submit it to examination, flits away like a spectre in the night, or, like the chameleon, changes its ever-varying hue? Who and where is the man who can give a definition of Home Rule for Ireland that will survive even a cursory examination?

Mr. Gladstone's Government of Ireland Bill, which was brought before Parliament in April, 1886, and led to Mr. Gladstone's defeat, was, so far as we are aware, the only Home Rule project for Ireland which has reached that stage of existence, though it was fated to expire in its infancy. In the colonies we often hear the question asked, Why not grant Home Rule to Ireland? One prominent Home Ruler among us expressed his definition in the following words, which, if they do not make the reader much wiser than before, convey as good an idea of the ambiguities of the Irish demands, as viewed from a Home Ruler's point of view, as any we have met with:—

Ireland in short demands what New Zealand now enjoys—the care of her own liberties, and desires to take her place amongst the nations of the earth, not as the possessor of a republic or an independent monarchy, but as a nation at once prosperous and contented in the enjoyment of their freedom. Subservient to England (who will for ever remain Ireland's best market and natural defender) in all matters of Imperial concern, whilst in the full enjoyment of local self-government, then, and not till then, will Ireland take her place amongst the countries of the earth. When no longer treated as a mere province of England—for which nature never intended her,—no longer governed by martial law, or crushed by class legislation, no longer exhausted and decimated by recurrent famines, and forced emigration of the ablest of her sons, she will arise like the Phoenix from the ashes of her discontent; and learning, liberty, truth, religion, and justice, will once more co-exist in that unfortunate country.

It is unnecessary here to dissect this category of what Ireland demands, or what she anticipates as the result of her demands being granted. There appears to be an utter want of logical sequence between the causes and effects as therein laid down. It is not obvious how liberty will result from handing Ireland over to the National League, and the authors of the Plan of Campaign; truth or justice, from juries who

imperil their lives by giving a true and just verdict ; religion from a priesthood who teach that shooting landlords, bailiffs, or police engaged in the execution of the laws, is not murder. Yet we shall have to show specific cases of such teaching, which indeed, since the mission of Monsignor Persico, and the Papal mandate resulting therefrom, is in part admitted.

It may here be remarked that this definition gave rise to a newspaper controversy in which we took part, and in which the author of it started with the assurance that "Home Rule as a remedial measure for Ireland has never varied either in scope or design" since a certain meeting took place in Dublin in the year 1869. We were, however, enabled to evolve five distinct forms of Home Rule, which during that period had found advocates amongst Home Rulers, as testified by his own writings on the subject. These were :—(1) The restoration of the "National" Parliament ; (2) that of Fenian "Irish Republicans" ; (3) Mr. Butt's Federation ; (4) the Colonial Constitution ; (5) Mr. Gladstone's Government of Ireland Bill.

Let us first consider the National Parliament. Mr. Gladstone, in a speech at Liverpool during the election contest of 1886, asserted that—"The Parliament of Ireland, when it was extinguished, was five hundred years old. It was not a gift to Ireland ; it had sprung from the soil." Mr. Gladstone has made many speeches, besides writing letters, on the subject of "the old original National Parliament of Ireland," but they are not always consistent. He sacrifices too much to oratorical effect, and is carried away, as Mr. Disraeli once expressed it, by the "exuberance of his own verbosity." In a letter to Mr. Sydney Buxton, dated 29th June, 1886, he wrote :—"A hundred years ago we gave Ireland a free Parliament of her own, with which she was satisfied. Its constitution was faulty, but it made many and great improvements, and was beginning to make more and greater when, in 1795, the Tory Government of England stopped the work by recalling Lord Fitzwilliam, to the horror of every Liberal statesman of the day, and of the whole Irish people, etc." Now, here we have two versions which are hard to reconcile. It was five hundred years old, it had sprung from the soil, it was not a gift to Ireland, yet we gave it to her a hundred years ago. But when we gave her the old Parliament, which for nearly five hundred years had been growing like sorrel from the Irish soil, we are told that she was satisfied with it, notwithstanding its faulty constitution. It is true that what was called the Parliament of the Pale existed as far back as the reign of Edward II., but it was anything but a National Parliament. It was well described in Lord Clare's famous speech upon the Union in the Irish House of Lords, on the 10th February, 1800 :—

"But what," he says, "is the fact which stands recorded and authenticated beyond doubt or controversy? That Ireland, before the accession of James I., never had anything like a regular Government or Parliamentary Constitution. In the reign of Edward II., the descendants of the first English settlers had a provincial assembly which was called the Parliament of the Pale.* The same sort of assembly was occasionally summoned during several successive reigns; and any man who will take the trouble to read the statute book will find that the principal business of them all was to pass ordinances of outlawry against the native Irish, and inhabitants of English blood connected with them. But such was the contempt in which these assemblies were held, that even the colonists of the Pale considered it an insult to be summoned to attend them."

Mr. Gladstone had spoken of this old Irish Parliament as a "National Parliament," but when driven step by step by Lord Brabourne's incisive criticism,† into a corner from which there was no retreat, he explained in a letter to the Editor of *Blackwood*—"Mr. Gladstone calls the old Irish Parliament 'National,' as meaning that it was not given to Ireland by any exterior agency, like the statutory Assemblies and Parliaments of our colonies, but was a growth of the soil in the settled part of the country." Did Mr. Gladstone—we would ask—intend to convey this idea to the electors of the United Kingdom when he railed at the "Tory" Government which had deprived Ireland of this Provincial Parliament, from which the bulk of the Irish people were excluded, who had indeed no voice in elections to it? What did the Tory Government deprive them of? That in which they had no right or interest. What did the same Government give them in exchange? Union with Great Britain on terms of equality.

Most people at the present time know what the Irish regard as "national." The descendants of the Norman invaders, or of the English settlers who at more recent periods located themselves in Ireland, have never been incorporated with the Celtic people who under their several kings or chiefs occupied the island, or portions of it, at the time of the invasion in the twelfth century. To this day it is the custom of those who call themselves "Nationalists" to speak of the colonists as the English garrison; how then could Mr. Gladstone pretend that Ireland had a National Parliament with which she was satisfied? How could she be satisfied with a Parliament from which a large majority of the population of all classes were excluded, and were unrepresented? It may be well, however, to enquire into the working of this National

* "The Pale," says Plowden, "comprised the counties of Dublin, Kildare, Meath, and Louth, with the cities of Waterford, Cork, and Limerick, and the lands immediately surrounding them."

† "Facts and Fictions in Irish History," by Lord Brabourne, in *Blackwood's Magazine* for October and November, 1886.

Parliament with which Ireland was satisfied ; but we must first quote another of Mr. Gladstone's descriptions of this Parliament when speaking of it at Glasgow as the Parliament which passed the Act of Union, which Act it was his policy to decry, but it was, nevertheless, exactly the same Parliament which on other occasions he eulogised. In that Glasgow speech it was described as "a miserably constituted Parliament—a Parliament of three hundred, in which there were one hundred and sixteen placemen, and in which a large number of the remaining members were returned by nomination boroughs." We do not dispute this description, which we believe to be substantially correct ; but, if so, how was it that the Irish were satisfied with such a corrupt Parliament, notwithstanding their own exclusion ? But we are further informed, on Mr. Gladstone's authority, that "it made many and great improvements, and was beginning to make more, and greater," when the horrid English Tory Government—ah, well ! we prefer not to follow Mr. Gladstone when he rides his anti-Tory hobby ; he might have had some respect for the predecessors of the party, of which, some forty years later, he became such a distinguished ornament. But Mr. Gladstone went very much further than merely railing at Tories for being Tories ; he has used very strong language in reference to those who brought about the Union ; language which appears to us to be altogether unjustifiable, and unsupported by any reliable history. Speaking at Glasgow, Mr. Gladstone said :

"We took the Parliament of Ireland from her in 1800 by fraud and force—by a mixture of fraud and force as disgraceful as has ever been recorded in history. . . . Through the Executive Government of England," he adds, "the foulest and most monstrous corruption, joined with the grossest intimidation, was exercised to defile the minds and to purchase the votes of the Irish Parliament."

At Liverpool he used still more emphatic expressions :—

I know of no blacker or fouler transaction in the history of man than the making of the Union. Fraud is bad, and force—violence as against right—is bad ; but if there is one thing more detestable than another, it is the careful, artful combination of force and fraud applied in the basest manner to the attainment of an end which all Ireland—for the exceptions might almost be counted on your fingers—detested, the Protestants even more than the Roman Catholics. In the Irish Parliament there were 300 seats, and out of these there were 116 placemen and pensioners. The Government of Mr. Pitt rewarded with places those who voted for them, and took away the pensions of those who were disposed to vote against them. . . . That the detestable Union of fraud and force might be consummated, the bribe was held out to the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy, in the hope of at any rate slackening their opposition, that if only they would consent to the Union it should be followed by full admission to civil privileges, and by endowments, etc., etc. Well, I have heard of more bloody proceedings,—the Massacre of St. Bartholomew was a more cruel

proceeding,—but a more base proceeding, a more vile proceeding, is not recorded, in my judgment, upon the page of history, than the process by which the Tory Government of that period brought about the Union with Ireland.

Why all this extravagant language and invective against the Pitt Ministry? The Act of Union had to be destroyed to suit Mr. Gladstone's new Parnell alliance policy; but in his second Edinburgh speech Mr. Gladstone used the following words: "Gentlemen, I tell you frankly that I am not prepared to consent to the repeal of the Union;" and went on to say that "the repeal of the Union means the permitted revival of the old original National Parliament of Ireland," &c. Why, then, did Mr. Gladstone object to repeal this much-abused Act? Perhaps the repeal of the Union was a shock it might not have been prudent to put before the constituencies at that time; but there is an old saying, that "if you give a dog a bad name, then you may hang him." So the Act of Union being doomed in the Gladstonian councils, and the electors not being as yet prepared for its immediate execution, it was desirable to go through the preliminary stage, as with the dog, of giving it a bad name. It had been doomed, for Lord Selbourne (Mr. Gladstone's Lord Chancellor in 1885) stated in a letter to the *Times* on the 1st May, 1886, that "Mr. Gladstone's scheme is really a repeal of the Union."

In a letter to Mr. G. Leveson Gower we find these words:—

I am amazed at the deadness of *vulgar opinion* to the *blackguardism and baseness*—no words are strong enough—which befoul the whole history of the Union.

This latter choice extract was, on its republication in *Blackwood*, modified by Mr. Gladstone in a letter to the editor of that magazine, by withdrawing the word "blackguardism," which was never meant for publication. Still, Mr. Gladstone must have known that everything he wrote bearing on the Irish question was, at the time of the general election, sure to find its way into print, whether written for that purpose or not. We add one short extract from Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet, "History of an Idea," page 11:—"Unspeakably criminal, I own, were the means by which the Union was brought about, and utterly insufficient were the reasons for its adoption."

An investigation into the circumstances which preceded the passing of the Act of the Union would occupy more space than we can devote to it. In his work, "English in Ireland," Mr. Froude gives a history of the transaction in considerable detail, and quotes portions of the official correspondence between the Pitt Ministry in England and Lord Cornwallis, who was at that time Viceroy in Ireland; and it appears to us

that Mr. Froude deals with the historical facts in a very impartial manner. From an English statesman, who for several years had himself contended with the full force of Irish obstructiveness as Mr. Gladstone has done, we might expect at least justice towards his own countrymen, who assuredly have not been backward in rewarding any services he may have rendered to them; yet he pours out the vials of his wrath against them in the passages we have quoted, *inter alia*; whilst his former foes have, since his complete surrender to them, become immaculate patriots. It may throw some light upon who were the real patriots engaged in an uncongenial task if we quote Lord Cornwallis's account of his dealings with the Irish Parliament, which Mr. Gladstone told the people of Liverpool, was working out patiently and steadily the regeneration of Ireland.

"I long," wrote the unhappy Viceroy, "to kick those whom my public duty obliges me to court. My occupation is to negotiate and job with the most corrupt people under heaven. I despise and hate myself every hour for engaging in such dirty work, and am supported only by the reflection that without a Union the British Empire must be dissolved."

It is evident that Lord Cornwallis was troubled with patriotism, otherwise he might have overcome the difficulty by a surrender to "the most corrupt people under heaven," and then, instead of being taunted with blackguardism and baseness, he might have been handed down to posterity as the greatest statesman of his day. We now quote from the speech of Lord Clare in defence of the Union:—

We are told, by giving up a separate Government and separate Parliament, we sacrifice national dignity and independence. . . . Is the dignity and independence of Ireland to consist in the continued depression and unredeemed barbarism of the great majority of the people, and the factious contentions of a puny and rapacious oligarchy, who consider the Irish nation as their political inheritance, and are ready to sacrifice the public peace and happiness to their insatiate love of patronage and power? I hope I feel, as becomes a true Irishman, for the dignity and independence of my country, and therefore I would elevate her to her proper station in the rank of civilised nations. I wish to advance her from the degraded post of a mercenary province to the proud station of an integral and governing member of the greatest empire in the world. I wish to withdraw the higher orders of my countrymen from the narrow and corrupted sphere of Irish politics, and to direct their attention to objects of national importance.

The next extract is from a speech of the Duke of Argyll in the House of Lords, on the meeting of the new Parliament in 1886:—

The question of the morality of the Union of 1800 cannot be affected by the addition of forty or forty-five members to the Parnellite party in the House of Commons. Morality does not depend on party

exigencies, and I repudiate the whole argument. In the first place, even if it were true, nothing would be more childish than to condemn the Government on that ground. How was the reformation of the Church affected? Will Mr. Gladstone contend that the atrocities of Henry VIII. afford reason for pulling down the Church. I deny altogether the immorality of the Union. I say that it was impossible to get the government of Ireland out of the hands of the Irish Parliament except by paying the price which the existing law enabled the members to demand. The money then paid was much more a ransom than a price; and let me tell the leaders of the Liberal party, whoever they may be, that there is no man, and there is no party in this country, who can with impunity revile the character of Mr. Pitt. Look at his speeches in 1800, and compare them with the shrieking speeches we have heard at this day. Look at the magnanimity of his tone towards Ireland, and the manifest desire he had to raise Ireland, to make her perfectly equal with England in a united Parliament, and to induce her to take an equal part in the management of imperial affairs. I take exception to the whole argument, and I maintain that the conduct of Mr. Pitt was pure and elevated conduct, with a pure and elevated purpose.

The speech of Lord Clare, from which we have just quoted, shows the feeling at the time of the Union with which a really patriotic Irishman regarded it. Lord Clare was not one of the sham patriots who make a trade of what they call patriotism, while they are bringing ruin upon their country. He was a man who, when he was Mr. Fitzgibbon, Attorney-General, repeatedly stood up in the Irish House of Commons and rebuked the follies into which the "patriots" were prone to rush, such as when they almost with one voice rejected Mr. Pitt's commercial resolutions, which we refer to elsewhere.

The speech of the Duke of Argyll, whilst defending the action of Mr. Pitt from the extraordinary denunciations so lavishly poured out in Mr. Gladstone's series of orations, at the same time administers a very caustic rebuke to the latter in the opening passages of the foregoing quotation, and indeed throughout the speech. When we compare the policies of these two statesmen, or more correctly we should say, when we contrast them, it is no difficult task to decide which was the real friend of Ireland, which the greater statesman, which the real patriot. The man who raised her to a position of equality as an integral part of the foremost nation of the earth, or the man who contended with those who he said were aiming at the destructive policy of "disintegration and dismemberment," who surrendered to them, and tried to surrender Ireland into their hands. Or, again, is the greater statesman he who stakes all for his country, or he who prefers his party?

Another writer expressed his ideas of Home Rule thus:—
 "It is surely inexplicable that a people enjoying the perfect autonomy which has been conferred upon these colonies, should

deny to another part of the Empire equal privileges." Let us ask the writer whether he has ever sought for an explanation, or whether he can show that the cases are so nearly parallel as to render it even probable that the same mode of treatment would have the same result in each case? In the first place has he not overlooked the fact that Ireland has Home Rule in a higher degree than we have, and therefore she is asking for a retrograde step, not an advance. Ireland stands in relation to the Imperial Parliament in the same position that we in Auckland do in relation to the Wellington Parliament; so she asks for the privilege of going backwards. She has 103 members out of 670; or one in 50,241 of her population. England, Scotland, and Wales, have 567 members, or one to 52,429 of their population; therefore, Ireland has about four members more than her fair share. Will any one argue that New Zealand or Tasmania occupy as high a position in relation to the Empire as Scotland does? The colonies are rapidly growing, and already we hear sounds of impatience of control, but that control has become a theory rather than a reality. The tie is in reality one of patriotic affection; perhaps, also, self-interest helps to cement it. We are colonists certainly, but we are none the less Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Welshmen. With Irishmen it is different; there are two sets of Irishmen, but how shall they be defined? It will not do to say the Roman Catholic and the Protestant, though as a rough definition that would not be far out. The same may be said of the Celtic and the Saxon, but there will still be exceptions. It would be better to define them as the "Irish Irishman," and the "British Irishman." It is absurd to call the Irish a nation; they have some characteristics in common derived from contact, but they are offshoots of two nations at least, and the line of demarcation has become more distinct within the last quarter of a century or so. One day, at one of the public buildings in Paris, a gentleman hearing us speaking English, came up and asked for some information. We recognised him immediately as an American, and we got into conversation; presently asking, incidentally, what part of the States he was from? He seemed surprised, and asked in reply how we came to know he was an American? We should prefer to live under the British ensign than under the stars and stripes, but there in Paris, we looked upon this American almost as a countryman. A Yorkshireman would have been more marked by his dialect than he was. But Yorkshireman, Scotchman, or American, all were as friends and countrymen when met on foreign soil; but with an Irishman caution would be necessary to discover whether he was friend or foe. Those who ostentatiously refused to drink the Queen's health on a public occasion, for instance, could there be any hesitation whether

to regard them as friends or foes? A "British Irishman," on the other hand, is generally a very pleasant Englishman, with more or less of a brogue, and often with the quick wit, and some other characteristics of the land of his birth.

If Ireland had obtained Home Rule under Mr. Gladstone's Bill, those who imagine that it would have brought about peace and goodwill in that island, or between Ireland and the rest of the Kingdom, must be very ill informed on the subject. The most determined opponents of Home Rule are the Irish minority themselves. What did Mr. Parnell say of them in 1881? "This Whig Ulster party has no longer a place in Ireland. There is no longer room for them in Irish politics." This was no doubt an indiscreet admission, and after the alliance with the Gladstonians in 1886 it was toned down to bring it more into conformity with the new trade mark of that party, "Union of hearts." Then he told the same Ulster party, "We want you all, we cannot spare a single Irishman." The first was addressed to Irish peasantry at Strabane, in Ireland, on the 30th August, 1881; but the revised version was addressed to the House of Commons. We have not heard of many Ulstermen, or many Protestants in other parts of Ireland who show a disposition to listen to the voice of the charmer.

In the *Westminster Review* of June, 1888, there was an article on this subject, from the pen of Mr. T. W. Russell, the Liberal Unionist member for South Tyrone. He says Irish Liberals are in no doubt about what has come to be called Home Rule, but English Liberals are being constantly deceived regarding it. He ridicules the idea of Protestant Home Rulers, and a Protestant Home Rule Association. Both, he says, have an existence of a kind, and Mr. Parnell is wise enough to encourage the delusion.

We have also in the House one of the class in the person of Mr. Swift McNeill; and, as I write, my old friend Mr. Thomas A. Dickson is appealing to the electors of Dublin as such.* In Dublin, probably, the party with their uncles, cousins, and aunts, could fill a hall capable of holding two hundred people. In all Ulster they could not even do this, and Mr. Dickson is a standing proof of the fact . . . His record in Ulster disposes of the question of Protestant Home Rule. He was beaten in Dungannon. He fled from South Tyrone. He was rejected by Armagh, and Antrim would have none of him. All this happened to him as a Gladstonian Liberal. He did not even venture in 1886 to contest an Ulster seat. Why is it so? Well, we object not only to Home Rule—we object to the Home Rulers. Let us take Belfast. Ever since the Union it has been governed by the same laws as Dublin

* Mr. Dickson was returned for St. Stephen's Green, Dublin, in May, 1888, the seat was vacated by the death of Mr. E. D. Gray, late Lord Mayor of Dublin; but Mr. Dickson was not returned by Protestants, as he received, within 200 votes, the support accorded to the late Mr. Gray, an ardent Nationalist. Mr. Dickson's death was reported in July last.

or Cork. Whatever may have been the blighting and mildewing influence of British rule, Belfast has been subject to it as much as either of these cities. But what are the facts? In 1840 the population of the northern capital was 70,000; to-day it is 240,000. In 1862 the valuation of the town was £279,000; to-day it is £638,977. In 1837 the amount of deposits in Belfast and other branch banks was £972,513; in 1887 it was £8,182,000. The tonnage which cleared the port in 1837 was 288,143 tons; in 1887 it was 1,657,880 tons. The Customs returns give Belfast as third in the order of British ports, viz.:—London, Liverpool,

| | | | | | | |
|---------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------------|
| Belfast | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | £1,675,323 |
| Glasgow | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 1,012,157 |
| Dublin | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 886,496 |
| Leith | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | 597,796 |

Why has Belfast gone forward by leaps and bounds whilst Dublin and Cork have retrograded or stood still? There must be a reason. It cannot be British rule—Belfast has been under it. It cannot be geographical advantage—both Dublin and Cork are more favourably placed. And what is true of Belfast is true of North-East Ulster. Derry, Coleraine, Ballymena, Portadown, Lurgan, Lisburn, and other towns have all shot ahead—whilst Limerick, Waterford, Galway, Kilkenny and Clonmel have gone back or remained stationary. Now Mr. Gladstone's proposals meant this, that all the wealth created in North-East Ulster, all its prosperity, all its moral force, was to be placed under the rest of the country which possessed none of these attributes—at least, to nothing like the same extent. In any Irish Parliament North-East Ulster would have been swept by the board. Its property, its rights, civil and religious, would have been at the mercy of the rest of Ireland . . . Take the Irish party as it exists. Where in the whole party is there a man who could be called an authority in commercial matters? Why should Belfast merchants be willing to trust their gigantic interests to newspaper scribblers like Mr. Gill or Mr. Harrington, to publicans and to politicians of the stamp of Dr. Tanner, Mr. Douglas Pyne, and Mr. Joseph Nolan?

These extracts, from an article by an Irish Liberal M.P., published in the "Independent Section" of a Gladstonian organ as though to challenge refutation, which we have not met with in the same Review (or elsewhere), are an emphatic answer to those who argue that Ireland should have Home Rule because the majority of her members and their constituents claim it. But, it may be asked, can the result of the polls in Ireland be taken as the voice of the electors, when such an organised system of pressure, by the League and its agents and organs, exists by means of boycotting and otherwise, that very many of the Irish dare not do anything contrary to the mandates of the League or its local branches? Besides, the Roman Catholic system of confessional exists in Ireland, and the priests in many places combine the offices of Father confessor and chairman of the local branch of the League. This may be illustrated by a quotation from the work of a French naval officer, himself a Roman Catholic, who in 1887 visited Ireland for the purpose of investigating

for himself into the causes of Irish discontent. We give the account in the writer's own words, premising that the anecdote was related to a dinner party of eight or ten persons by an Irish parish priest, who was, he says, very intelligent and full of racy humour, and who particularly impressed upon the company the sympathy of the clergy for the Land League.

"The other day," said he "one of my colleagues was playing billiards with his vicar, when a message was brought to him that a man wanted to confess to him in the vestry. He immediately went, took his place in the confessional, and the man commenced the enumeration of his sins.

" 'My father,' said he, 'I confess that three months ago I shot a man and killed him.'

" 'Oh oh !' thought the priest, 'this is a serious matter.'

"He still held the billiard chalk in his hand, and with it made a mark on his left sleeve.

" 'Go on, my son,' he said aloud.

" 'That is not all,' stammered the man. 'Two days later I shot Paddy Ryan—but I only wounded him.'

"The priest made a second mark on his sleeve, and repeated with a sigh :

" 'Go on, my son.'

" 'Since that I have shot at Corney O'Sullivan, and then at Tim O'Flaherty, and then again at Timothy O'Hagan.'

"The priest sprung up in his arm-chair.

" 'Good heavens, my son ! but what had all these men done to you that you wished to hurry them into eternity ? Who were they ?'

" 'Oh my father ! they were all bailiffs or tax collectors.'

" 'Idiot,' growled the priest, furiously rubbing his sleeve, 'Why didn't you say so before, instead of letting me spoil my best cassock ?'

This story was much relished by the lay guests at dinner. It was less appreciated by the ecclesiastics present. It was related as a good joke ; but at the same time, we quite understood that the joke was intended to give the key to the present state of feeling amongst many of the Irish priests, and the narrator added that he was himself the president of the League in his district.

This story is not supposed to be taken quite literally, but it may afford a good clue to the style of religious (?) instruction that many of the Irish peasantry are subjected to. The author of the book from which the extract is taken is, as has been already stated, a French naval officer, the Baron E. de Mandat-Grancey.* In his preface, he speaks of the sympathy with which his countrymen have for centuries watched the struggle of the Irish against England. He tells us that, until the commencement of this century, the brutality and perfidy she (England) has displayed, surpass all that one could imagine, in support of which sweeping condemnation, he quotes from a Statute of the reign of Queen Anne, which was undoubtedly severely repressive of the Roman Catholics, so far as civil rights were concerned; but he seems to forget that the Protestants had no cause to love or trust the Roman Catholics. The memory of the Armada had not died out. The insurrection of 1641, still more recent, was far more drastic in its design than any Statute. It was intended for the extermination of the English in Ireland with savage ferocity, and many thousands were so slaughtered before the rebellion was repressed. But we have not quoted from our French author as an historian of the past, as we have more reliable sources of information than he seems to have had, but we quote from his book, "Paddy at Home," because his facts are so valuable, as he, a French officer, went to Ireland with introductions to leading men on both sides, which admitted him very much behind the scenes. By the Irish peasantry he was received as a friend, not only as being a foreigner, and a Roman Catholic who attended mass in their churches, but because also they retain traditions of French support in former rebellions. He admits that he started with a bias in favour of the Irish side, yet, throughout his book the balance of his evidence is strongly in favour of the contentions of the English Unionists. We have alluded to the author's theory, which he was anxious to verify. He says the Irish attribute their misery to England's tyranny, whilst the English reply that under the same laws the English people are rich and prosperous, and assert that the Irish have only themselves to blame for their misery; and he asks, May it not quite simply result from economic causes? His theory is that the facility of transport is tending to level the value of land and population all over the world, and is consequently ruining agriculture in Europe. In France, he says, this evolution is only commencing, and is retarded by the accumulation of capital and fertility of the soil. But in Ireland, where no capital exists, and where the soil is poor, this evolution commenced long ago, and its consequences must be more terrible

* "Paddy at Home" ("Chez Paddy"), by the Baron E. de Mandat-Grancey.

than anywhere else. The Baron is a thoughtful writer, and we have no desire to write disparagingly of his theory, but will admit at once that it may be regarded as a cause, though, as we think, quite a minor cause, and in no way disposes of the social, religious, or political causes which in our opinion act in conjunction with it; and we are supported in this view by passages scattered throughout his very interesting and instructive book. We will not here argue this particular contention at any length, because it is the object of this treatise to consider the several causes of Irish discontent, and bring forward the opinions of other writers for or against our own contentions.

Briefly, then, we here state why we regard the Baron's theory as embodying only a minor one of many causes, not as the chief or sole cause. Firstly, it should be pointed out that, with the exception of the Church, there is an analogy of conditions between Scotland and Ireland. Both are affected by the fall in the prices of produce. The latter, we imagine, has some advantage in climate and soil; and it certainly has an unusual advantage in the legislation which in that island modified contracts to meet this very difficulty, by compulsorily adjusting rent to meet the times, and that not once only but twice within the last eight years, and, further, by Lord Ashbourne's Act for assisting the tenants to become freeholders. Is there any land legislation in the world so favourable to the tenants as that now operating in Ireland? Another cause is the yearning after a revival of their nationality, which we have answered elsewhere. In connection with this must be mentioned the constant irritation kept up, on the one hand by the Roman Catholic priesthood, jealous for the ascendancy of their Church, and hostile to Protestantism, and, on the other hand, the animosity of the American Irish, stimulated by professional agitators for their own selfish ends, and by a shamefully corrupt Press in their interest, which, notwithstanding the boasted freedom in the States, has grown into a power hostile to freedom, and hostile to political independence. The author of "Paddy at Home" speaks of no capital existing in Ireland. This is not strictly correct, but it is mainly in English hands, and the League—National it is called—has done, and is doing, its best to drive away capital and capitalists. We hear much of absentee landlords, who are spoken of in terms of execration; but is it likely landlords will reside in Ireland to be shot at or boycotted? Then, again, the author we are quoting from testifies to the fondness of Paddy for whisky, and this propensity is no doubt stimulated by the idleness and excitement resulting from the present disorganised condition of the country. Does any man in his senses really believe that all these causes would be removed

or allayed by giving the government of Ireland into the hands of the nominees of the League, elected by the peasantry, themselves too often the puppets of the priests?

There are other reasons besides those enumerated why it would not be practicable for the Empire to detach Ireland from the United Kingdom and place her on the footing of a colony. There is at the present time a feeling of uneasiness manifested in England as to the constantly-increasing strength of the French navy. It has been a maxim with us for generations that it is a necessity for the British navy to be equal to any probable combination against us; numerically, indeed, superior on account of the enormous and scattered interests it has to protect in all parts of the world. If such was the case in the days of sailing ships, how much the more so in the days of steam, when a hostile fleet could choose time and place, and cross the Channel in a few hours, when our Channel fleet might be drawn off perhaps by a false alarm designedly raised in an opposite direction? We know that at the close of the last century, and on other occasions, the Irish themselves have invited French ships and troops to make Ireland a base of operations against England. Now, with all the evidence of unrelenting hostility still existing, notwithstanding that all real grievances have been removed, we are asked to make Ireland as independent as a colony. Yet the idea is very general that if any one of these Australasian Colonies desired to claim independence, the Mother Country would not oppose the claim by force of arms. Now we ask, would it not be an act of extreme folly to put Ireland in a position to throw off her allegiance, and become a base of operations for any nation with which we might be at war? We have had plenty of warnings in the past, and in the present we have abundant evidence as to how little concessions have done to reconcile Ireland to a position of equality so long as the great supposed grievance, which is at the root of the whole matter of Irish discontent, is not, and cannot be, removed. For Great Britain, which is essentially a Protestant nation; which again and again has had to fight against the domination of Rome; which, in the time of Queen Elizabeth, was providentially enabled to resist the mighty efforts made to bring her again under the yoke of the Roman Church; Britain cannot, and short of national insanity will not, allow that Church to become not merely the Church of the Irish majority, tolerated as it is throughout the British dominions, but the dominant ecclesiastical authority in Ireland, tolerating no rivalry, bent on crushing what it detests—Protestantism, or, as it calls it, heresy. Let any one study the history of Ireland, from the Reformation to this day, and judge what would be the result

of giving the government of Ireland into the hands of the Roman Catholic hierarchy. Mr. Parnell is said to be a Protestant ; he is doing the work of the Roman Church, and they make use of him, but how long would he be at the head of the Irish Government if they had Colonial or any other form of Home Rule established in Dublin ?

With these facts before us, the question very naturally arises, what is the reason why Ireland wants to be put back a large step in rank ? Is it because she does not get a fair share of the legislation of the United Parliament ? On the contrary, she has had the largest share for years past. There is but one sufficient explanation we can find, why she seeks to give up part of what she has gained, and take an inferior status. She has told us over and over again she wants "National Independence." But why does she want it ? Why should a child cry for the moon ? Celtic Ireland is wiser in her generation than the child is ; she wants Roman Catholic independence and predominance, which she cannot have while she constitutes a part of the United Kingdom. Look around, even here at the Antipodes, who are the leaders of the Home Rule party ? Are there any bishops or priests of the Church of Rome in the deputations which promptly interview any celebrity who comes here, after swearing allegiance to Mr. Gladstone and adopting his Home Rule creed, whatever that may happen to be at the time when wanted ? Why are these reverend gentlemen such enthusiastic advocates of Home Rule ? It cannot be that they approve of its modes of carrying on its agitation ; its cruelties under the name of boycotting, or the blackmail process called the Plan of Campaign. Do they want Mr. Parnell and his colleagues to make laws for them in Dublin ? That, we imagine, would not come within their programme, except perhaps as a temporary expedient to start the machinery in good working condition. That they contemplate Home Rule on the lines laid down by Mr. Gladstone is simply out of the question, unless we are to look upon them as a house divided against itself. We have before us a report of a speech by Dr. Walsh, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin ; the date of it was September 4th, 1885, when he had just returned from Rome. From that speech we quote the following passage :—

In Leo XIII. we have a Pontiff and a father whose sympathy with us is no mere sentimental affection—it is a sympathy that is based upon the utmost knowledge of all the circumstances of our case. For this you owe no thanks to me. You owe it to the devoted prelates who went out from Ireland some months ago, and whose expressions of the wants and wishes, the aims and desires of the Irish people, urged, as they were, with a practical unanimity, of which I venture to say no

episcopacy in all the world-wide Church could furnish another example, has put an end, I believe for ever, to any danger that may formerly have existed of the cause of Ireland being misrepresented at Rome.

Cardinal Moran on the occasion of an interview at Sydney, which we refer to elsewhere, is reported to have said that he is even more advanced than Dr. Walsh is in his "aspiration for the *National Independence of Ireland*." He further states that he has "the *national cause deeply at heart*." Like all Home Rulers, however, Cardinal Moran, if he be correctly reported, becomes ambiguous as the reporter proceeds to draw him out. Speaking of the Pope as having only condemned "some of the excrescences on the national movement," and the probable effect upon the opinions of the educated classes both in England and Ireland, he anticipates as a result "that even the present Tory Government may be forced to yield to the demand for Irish self-government." No one will deny that "national independence" and "self government" *may* mean the same thing, though it is not usual to find the advocate of the latter identifying it with the former. It is, however, quite out of the question to identify the sort of Home Rule as laid down in Mr. Gladstone's Bill with National Independence; the two cannot exist concurrently, as Cardinal Moran must know if he has examined the Government of Ireland Bill, for reasons we shall presently explain. Yet we find the Cardinal further saying that by the action of the Holy See, he believes the hands of Mr. Gladstone will be materially strengthened, and the Irish cause itself enormously benefited. All this is consistent on the view we adopt, and have adopted since Mr. Gladstone's surrender, which may be stated thus:—Home Rule from an Irish priest's point of view means National Independence—with its concomitant, a National Church. Mr. Gladstone's Bill is inconsistent with this purpose, but would lead to it unless prevented by force. It proposes to place the Government of Ireland in the hands of the Nationalists, subject to various paper restrictions; the Dublin Police, at the end of two years, to be subject to the Irish Legislature; the Royal Irish Constabulary may be abolished; and the Irish Legislature may provide police in counties and boroughs. Provision is made for removal and pensioning of Judges and Civil Servants. The Executive Government to be carried on by the Lord Lieutenant, with the aid of such officers and such council as Her Majesty may from time to time appoint. The Customs and Excise revenue to be collected by and on behalf of "the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury," nearly £5,000,000 of which to be appropriated as provided by the said Act, and not by the Irish Legislature.

Now, with the whole executive authority in Ireland under control of his Government, and with a large military force available if required, Mr. Gladstone contested with the League, Land or National (much the same thing with the name changed), and the contest continued for years, until at last he gave up the contest, and surrendered to them, rather than coalesce with his political rivals against them. Mr. W. E. Forster, with all his straightforward honesty of purpose, but deserted by his chief at a critical moment, withdrew from the contest in 1882. Mr. Balfour, notwithstanding his resolute firmness, and his fearless discharge of his duty, has had to contend against both Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell and all their adherents, yet he has attained a hopeful measure of success, notwithstanding that Mr. Gladstone had, as he assumed, exhausted "the resources of civilization" before he gave in; thus showing that the want of success of Mr. Balfour's predecessors in office arose from irresolution and timidity in the councils of the Government, rather than departmental weakness. But one thing appears certain, that if Mr. Parnell and his allies could wrest the government of Ireland out of the hands of Mr. Gladstone while the Executive, the Police, and the military, were subject to his control, there would be no check to oppose to a League in possession of the legal Government if they desired to carry out the policy indicated by Cardinal Moran. In such an event nothing short of a military and naval interposition—of civil war, in fact—would be able to prevent the disruption of the United Kingdom, with all its attendant evil consequences. How promptly would the inventors of boycotting, and of the Plan of Campaign, tear up all Mr. Gladstone's twenty subsections by which he fondly hoped to fetter them. What could he do? The "resources of civilization" would have passed, by his means, into their hands, and if he ventured over to Ireland to try the effect of an oration, they might perhaps instruct their police to lock him up as a suspect in Kilmainham.

GRATTAN'S PARLIAMENT,

which grew out of the Parliament of the Pale, or the "old original National Parliament of Ireland," as Mr. Gladstone described it in one of his speeches, has been already referred to as exclusively a Parliament of the Protestant colonists, from which the native Irish were excluded. But we have not yet shown in what way, and to what extent, Grattan's Parliament holds out a warning to us, to indicate the danger and embarrassment that may grow out of a second Parliament in the British Islands, even though the "last link," the Crown (as during the short continuance of the experiment in Grattan's time), should remain unsevered.

Grattan's Parliament was a result of the American War of Independence. "England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity" has been an Irish motto for generations, and about the year 1780 such an opportunity was afforded as was never likely to recur. Great Britain was endeavouring to restrain by force of arms the revolt of her American Colonies; France and Spain united against her, to avenge their own grievances by assisting in the dismemberment of their rival; whilst Russia and Holland formed a league with some minor States for the protection of the rights of neutrals, and to do a stroke of business for themselves by supplying England's enemies with munitions of war; the result of which combination was, that England declared war against Holland, preferring an open foe to a secret one. She had thus the three chief naval powers, next to herself, combined against her, besides being harassed by American privateers. This was Ireland's opportunity, the revolt in America was infectious, and the Irish became restless with a desire to follow the example of the colonies. The exigencies of the war had necessitated the drafting away most of the British troops from Ireland for service abroad, whilst American privateers were making incursions into Irish harbours, and capturing British vessels in St. George's Channel. The fortifications of the Irish ports had been neglected, and urgently needed repair to provide against invasion; whilst the want of troops could only be supplied by resorting to a militia force, or by permitting the enrolment of volunteers. The latter expedient was adopted as being the more popular, and at the same time promising to be least costly. No sooner was the decision given in favour of a volunteer force, than men began to enrol themselves with alacrity, and, in a few weeks, 40,000 men had been enrolled and armed with muskets from the Government stores. It was not, however, from a desire to help England in her difficulties, that so much alacrity had been displayed. The volunteers soon became a political power, and they were used to exercise pressure on the Parliament then existing, and indirectly upon the Viceroy. The volunteers were not under military law, and although they were in theory exclusively Protestants, and Catholics were by the law forbidden to possess arms, yet in the enthusiasm with which these volunteer corps had been raised, the religious test had not been strictly inquired into amongst the recruits, especially as Catholics had contributed largely to the necessary funds for their equipment and support.

We are, in these days, so much accustomed to speak of religious equality as an established institution in this nineteenth century which cannot be shaken, amongst British people at least, that we are apt to regard the restrictions that

existed in Ireland in the last, and early part of the present century, as the result of bigotry; whereas they were really caused by a keen recollection of the past, and an intuitive appreciation of the future. It may be well here to introduce some extracts from the speech of Lord Clare, in the Irish House of Lords, whom Mr. Froude describes as "the one supremely able man whom Ireland possessed," and who was thoroughly well acquainted with the past history of Ireland, and also with its then present condition—political, social, and ecclesiastical. On this occasion he was speaking against a Bill for the removal of Catholic disabilities. Speaking of the Catholics, he said—

We must look to the principles of their religion, and to the unerring influence which those principles have had upon the political government of every country in Europe for centuries. From this point of view there is not a single instance in which Protestants and Papists have agreed in exercising the political power of the same State; and as long as the claims of Rome to universal spiritual dominion over the Christian world shall be maintained, it is impossible that any man who admits them can exercise the legislative power of a Protestant State with temper and justice.

I wish young gentlemen who have urged the total repeal of the Popery laws, and have offered to embrace their Catholic brethren for the wise purpose of resisting English influence, would take the trouble to look into the laws of the Roman Catholic Church, where they will find the principles of fraternity on which their Popish fellow-subjects are willing to meet them, and the Constitution under which they will be governed, should this become a Popish country.

The descendants of the old Irish, who constitute the Catholic interest, feel that they can never recover the situation which their ancestors held in Ireland but by separation from Great Britain; and, therefore, if any man in Great Britain or Ireland is so wild as to hope that by communicating political power to the Catholics of Ireland they can be conciliated to British interests, he will find himself bitterly mistaken. Great Britain can never conciliate the descendants of the old Irish to her interests upon any other terms than by restoring to them the possessions and the religion of their ancestors in full splendour and dominion.

Does Mr. Gladstone contemplate restoring the Church of Rome in Ireland in full splendour and dominion; or is his present Irish policy "produced with a general, uninformed, and irreflective good intention," like the Encumbered Estates Act, on which we have elsewhere quoted his own verdict?

It is not our intention to follow, step by step, the process by which Grattan carried on the contest against the English Government. It was based on the embarrassments by which England was beset, and it was conducted on the principle of rendering government in Ireland, by British laws and British officials, if not impossible, a great addition to the difficulties

against which the British Ministry were then contending. A change of Ministry took place in February, 1882, and the Whigs succeeded to power, under the Marquis of Rockingham; and the Duke of Portland became Viceroy of Ireland. On his arrival at Dublin, the Duke found he had no easy task before him. Grattan had been for some time in communication with the Whigs, and on their accession to power he felt assured of success, and in his enthusiasm was inclined to be dictatorial. At one time the Duke seems to have contemplated abandoning Ireland to her own devices. He wrote to Fox, then a member of the Government, that if he delayed or refused to concede certain points that were demanded, "Government cannot exist here in its present form, and the sooner you recall your Lieutenant, and renounce all claim to this country the better." Eventually, however, the points in dispute were conceded, and the Irish Parliament (limited as it was to one section of the community) obtained very nearly legislative independence of England.

THE SPEECH OF SIR ROBERT PEEL,

on the 25th April, 1834, will give with convenient brevity the result, showing the enormous difficulty which must attend the co-existence of two parliaments in the same kingdom.

"The history of Ireland herself," says Sir Robert, "between the year 1782 and the period of the Union, is pregnant with evidence fatal to the re-establishment of the system under which her affairs were then administered—conclusive as to the fact, that under such a system the *connection between the two countries is in perpetual danger*. The annals of Irish history for that short period—a period of only eighteen years—present, first, an address to the Crown from the Irish Parliament on the subject of the special relations of Ireland to Portugal; which address—considered by Mr. Grattan a spiritless and languid address, because it did not demand instant reparation for the insult offered to Ireland—implied a right on the part of the Irish Parliament to resent the injury Ireland had sustained, and to take such effectual means as the honour and indispensable rights of Ireland might demand. Thus, one of two events might have occurred from the decision of the Irish Parliament: either the foreign relations of Great Britain with a friendly Power might have been disturbed, contrary to the wish of the British Parliament and the British Minister; or Ireland might have been involved in a war, to which Great Britain refused to be a party. The affair of Portugal occurred in 1782. In 1785, the propositions adopted by the Parliament of Great Britain for regulating the commercial intercourse of Ireland with Great Britain and her colonies, were necessarily abandoned in consequence of the opposition of the Irish Parliament. In 1788, upon the great question of Regency, it is perfectly notorious that the Parliaments of the two countries pursued a different course, acting upon principles at complete variance. . . . There have been only two occasions, in modern times, in which a difference between the two countries, as to the rights of sovereignty, could by possibility have occurred, and on both it did occur. The first was in respect of the title of William III. to the Crown of Ireland; the

second, the right of the Prince of Wales to the office of Regent. Within the short period of six years from the establishment of what is called the independence of the Irish Parliament—from the year 1782 to the year 1788,—the foreign relations of the two countries, the commercial intercourse of the two countries, the sovereign exercise of authority in the two countries, were the subjects of litigation and dispute; and it was owing more to accident than to any other cause that they did not produce actual alienation and rupture. Add to these sources of discord and misfortune a foreign invasion in 1796, and a savage rebellion in 1798, and what becomes of the boasted prosperity and happiness which Ireland is said to have enjoyed under the government of the independent Parliament?"

The foregoing speech by Sir Robert Peel, who is sometimes spoken of as Mr. Gladstone's political mentor, is quoted by Lord Brabourne in his "Facts and Fictions in Irish History," and brings into prominence the historical warnings against granting again a separate Parliament to Ireland; yet in the face of this, and of his numerous historical fictions, Mr. Gladstone, at Manchester, on the 25th June, 1886, said:—"Our opponents will not refer to history, or learn anything by experience from other nations of the world, and the history of our own country. I think they are very wise in not touching history. At every point it condemns them." Lord Brabourne, who quotes these words, gives a list of sixteen works as his authorities; and then he proceeds to make havoc of Mr. Gladstone's historical statements with great deliberation and studious politeness, but bringing clearly to the mind of the reader who it is that, as Macaulay wrote, is sometimes reduced "to escape from the legitimate consequences of his false principles under cover of equally false history."

Before leaving the subject of Grattan's Parliament, it may be desirable to explain more fully

THE COMMERCIAL PROPOSITIONS

which were summarily rejected by the Irish Parliament. Those who have access to Froude's "English in Ireland" will find it in vol. ii., book vii., section 8. Here we can only give a short outline, which will, however, show the spirit of conciliation with which Mr. Pitt dealt with the question, notwithstanding the jealous suspicion with which his efforts were met. Mr. Froude writes:—

Mr. Pitt's anxiety to restore Ireland to health and vigour was not confined to Parliamentary Reform. He desired to repair the injuries which had so long paralyzed her manufacturing industry; and although he would not indulge her inclination to rush into protective duties, which would have enriched a few traders at the expense of the Irish consumers, he was willing to risk unpopularity at home by giving Ireland a genuine participation in the commercial prosperity of England.

* * * * *

In the summer of 1784, Mr. Joshua Prim, a Dublin merchant, privately laid a scheme before Pitt, which in its commercial aspect was supremely favourable to Ireland—so favourable that his chief uncertainty was, whether the English Parliament could be induced to listen to it. Divided into eleven propositions, it was based on the principle of the equalisation of duties in both countries. The Irish linen manufacturers were to keep the protection which they at that time enjoyed in the English markets. Retaining the privilege of fixing their own scale of duties on their own products, they were enabled by a special article to control the duties imposed on such articles in England. Intelligent men of business both in England and Ireland were agreed the effect of the arrangement would be to make the Irish harbours the depots of a large part of English commerce, and must operate as a proportionate encouragement to Irish domestic manufacture. In adopting Mr. Prim's proposals, Pitt's intention was to present Ireland with a genial offering of national goodwill, to abolish the memory of ancient grievances, and to open a road to sound reconciliation. The Irish Parliament met on the 20th January . . . On the 7th of February, Mr. Orde, on behalf of the Government, produced the eleven resolutions. . . . Each of the first ten articles seemed either to be innocent, or to contain specific concessions to Irish interests. He arrived at the eleventh, the last. In return for a free, full, and perfect partnership with England, for free commerce with the English colonies, for exclusion of the linen of Russia and Germany from the English markets in favour of the Ulster looms, for the protection of the navy abroad and at home, and the assistance of the English Consular department in every part of the world, the Parliament of Great Britain expected Ireland to make some return. The condition required was so mild, that it would be inoperative until the Irish trade had become vigorous, and in times of depression would cease to bind. It was simply this, that for the protection of trade, whenever the gross hereditary revenue of Ireland should exceed £650,000, the excess should be applied to the support of the Imperial fleet.

On the Secretary resuming his seat, Mr. Barlow, the member for Armagh, rose to speak, in a state of great excitement. "He was hardly able to contain his indignation while the hon. gentleman was speaking; was astonished at his hardness in proposing a resolution tending to make Ireland a tributary nation to Great Britain. If the gifts of Britain are to be accompanied with the slavery of Ireland, he would hurl back her gifts with scorn," etc. This was of course a very foolish reception to give to a series of proposals so favourable to Ireland, that it was with great difficulty Pitt had persuaded the British Parliament to consent to them. Mr. Barlow had stirred up the national vanity, and every "patriot" in the House and out of it, refused to hear of the eleventh article. Even Grattan, who probably knew better, would not risk his popularity and influence by placing himself in opposition to a popular prejudice. The resolutions were passed with an amendment, but the British Parliament was not disposed to make further concession. Pitt introduced the modified resolutions in a speech in which he recommended Ireland to

ENGLAND'S PENITENT GENEROSITY,

and desired to extend to her full rights of partnership with England and Scotland. But the Irish had thrown away their opportunity—"Fox thought they conceded far too much to Ireland. They appeared to him to constitute Ireland grand arbitress of the commercial interests of the Empire." Pitt persevered, trying to re-model the scheme in a more acceptable form; but the jealous suspicion which his efforts had met with from the Irish Parliament, and their refusal to bind Ireland to contribute towards the general expenses, gave point to the petitions and remonstrances which came from the English side, against measures so favourable to Ireland; which remonstrances thus proved irresistible, and the efforts to benefit Ireland against her will were ultimately abandoned.

Throughout this transaction, and in his subsequent efforts for the pacification of, and friendly co-operation with Ireland, Mr. Pitt displayed the qualities of

A GREAT STATESMAN.

He fully appreciated the importance of unity of action between Great Britain and Ireland; Grattan claimed that Ireland had become a nation, and that the Crown was the only link that united her to England. But Irish enthusiasm is apt to overlook practical details and arrive at hasty conclusions. It was so in this case. The American Colonies had attained their independence by the surrender of Lord Cornwallis in October, 1781. The Civil War was ended, and England was able to devote her attention to her Continental foes. After Cornwallis's surrender, the allied fleets of France and Spain sailed to the West Indies, and the Leeward Islands surrendered to them one after another; but the English fleet, under Sir G. Rodney, arrived in time to save Jamaica, and on the 11th of April, 1782, the enormous armament of the allies was taken, sunk, or scattered, and their commander taken prisoner.

Gibraltar was held by the English, but it was besieged by France and Spain; and great preparations had been made by these allied Powers to storm that fortress. Enormous works had been thrown up at the neck of the peninsula, and from behind these works, the choicest troops of France and Spain were to advance, and drive the English into the sea. Ten thousand tons of powder had been distributed among the magazines, and all was ready for the attack, when General Ross with two thousand men stole out in the darkness of a November night, stormed the Spanish lines, swept the trenches, overthrew the palisades, and laying trains into the magazines, sent the results of twelve months' toil, and the

passionate hopes of England's enemies, with one wild roar into the air.* Again, ten months later, another attempt was made by the same Powers to storm this fortress; forty thousand men being collected for a land attack, and the combined fleets, supplemented by enormous floating batteries, which were anchored under the batteries of the fortress. The garrison were reduced to half rations of bread and rice. A terrible bombardment was opened on the 13th of September on Elliott and his five thousand English. They replied with red-hot shot, which set the floating batteries on fire, and at intervals, as "magazine after magazine exploded, in a glare of lurid splendour, blazing timber, and torn limbs of men, were shot as from a volcano, into the sulphur-loaded air. The ships of the besiegers lay paralysed by the appalling ruin, and after that awful night no more attempts were made to drive the English from the rock which they had so magnificently defended."

From the West Indies, and from Gibraltar, our subject now returns to Ireland. Grattan had obtained his concession of a quasi-independent Parliament, under pressure which the British Government were for the time unable to resist; not that the Irish volunteers constituted a very formidable force. The materials were good, no doubt; but they were utterly wanting in discipline, which is essential to the formation of good soldiers. They had more or less drill, but that is but an ingredient in the making of a soldier. Under cover of volunteering, it was openly stated in the Irish House of Commons, that parties of "ragged, dangerous-looking ruffians" were being drilled in the streets of Dublin, not for soldiers, but for the purpose of rebellion. The volunteers were very deficient in artillery, and other munitions, and the Commissariat department was non-existent. These volunteers became formidable only so long as Great Britain could not spare troops or ships to keep them from being mischievous. Now, by the Independence of the American Colonies, and the subsequent naval successes of England, the case was altered, and the Irish volunteers were no longer able to dictate terms to Great Britain, who had been able to defy the combined forces of France and Spain.

The Regency question had given rise to a very warm discussion in the Irish House of Commons, and in the course of this discussion, the Attorney-General, Mr. Fitzgibbon, afterwards Lord Clare, pointed out to the enthusiasts a serious flaw in their title to act independently of England. He reminded the House, that in redressing certain grievances of Ireland,

*"English in Ireland," Vol. II, page 322.

they had passed a law, "by which you enact that all Bills which pass the two Houses here, which shall be certified to England, and which shall be *returned under the Great Seal of England*, without any addition, diminution, or alteration whatever, shall pass into law, *and no other*." The historian adds :—"Not Shylock, when he heard Portia interpret the law of Venice, was more astounded than Grattan, when he learnt the value to Ireland of the Constitution of 1782."

COLONIAL SELF-GOVERNMENT.

The "autonomy" conferred upon these colonies is very far ahead of the Home Rule which was proposed by Mr. Gladstone for Ireland, and set out in his Bill, but with impracticable restrictions. Here the Governor has a veto on our legislation in some cases, and the Queen, theoretically, in all ; but, practically, these restraints only operate in a small percentage of cases. We control our Police ; and raise as many volunteer companies as we find necessary, or within our means. The Queen appoints our Governor, but our Parliament selects his Executive. We fix our Customs tariff, and control the Excise. We can have free trade or protection, or resort to the Customs for revenue purposes only. The Judges are selected by our Executive Government. We are so free in the matter of religion that the restrictions in Mr. Gladstone's Bill relating to religious belief, endowment, education, etc., are superfluous in our own case. In our exercise of freedom, we have abolished all religion from our public schools ; preferring apparently to give the devil an advantage with the children of all denominations, by keeping their minds in a fallow condition ready for the sower of tares, rather than any sect should get an undue advantage for the sowing of wheat.

There is, however, but a step between this colonial constitution and Independence, which colonists do not desire, but which is the aspiration of so many of the Irish, that, to grant them Colonial Home Rule, would be virtually granting National Independence.

MR. GLADSTONE.

IT was our intention to have confined our criticism of Mr. Gladstone to one chapter, and the greater part of this chapter was written with that purpose; but when we came to write on Home Rule, on Boycotting, on Coercion, on Evictions, etc., we found that Mr. Gladstone had become so completely identified with the subject, first as leader of the party which was opposed to granting a separate Parliament to Ireland; and then, after the general election of November, 1885, as the still more ardent leader of the Home Rule party; that it became a matter of difficulty to argue against Home Rule and Home Rulers, and yet to omit the versatile acts of the leading character in the drama. Furthermore, Mr. Gladstone's personal popularity has enabled him to exercise an influence on this question which is quite unique; and since that influence has been used to further that which he so long condemned, it behoves those who contend on the side of the Union, to analyze the sources of that influence, and to examine the means by which it has been established and sustained. In our preceding chapter we have shown how unblushingly historical facts have been distorted according to the exigencies of the occasion, the effect of which, if not the object, must have been to delude unwary and uneducated electors, by placing before them a representation of the old Irish Parliament in such contradictory guises, that the one or the other must have been a misrepresentation of facts; when, from the vital nature of the general issue, it was of the utmost importance that every point bearing on the case should be set forth, not merely truthfully, but with such lucidity as to come within the comprehension of those who, by their numerical superiority, have now become the arbiters to decide between the policy of maintaining the Union, or of yielding to those who aim at, as Mr. Gladstone himself expressed it, disintegration and dismemberment of the Empire.

Mr. Gladstone has shown no respect for the memory of some of England's best statesmen long in their graves; why then should his own conduct be exempted from the most searching criticism? If Mr. Pitt, instead of being an able and patriotic statesman, had been, together with his colleagues, such as Mr. Gladstone represented them in the speeches from which our quotations were taken, they are at least beyond doing further wrong; but Mr. Gladstone is still living and active, for good or for evil, and it is one of the political dogmas

of the day, which we are not disposed to assail, and which Gladstonians accept as a fundamental principle of their creed, that every man has a right to give expression to his political views. Theoretically, it might be desirable to qualify this dogma in the direction now adopted in so many of the minor affairs of life. The system of examinations is already carried to excess, but, whilst we do not admit a man to the junior ranks of the Civil Service, for instance, without submitting him to a test, and often a severe test, of his intellectual capacity and educational qualifications, on the other hand, we place the decision of the most vital national questions in the hands of those who could not answer a single question submitted as a test to the junior clerk. It may happen, indeed, that a vital question may be decided by the votes of those who turn the scale at an election, but who may be utterly illiterate, for, is not provision made in the conduct of elections to assist those who cannot even read the ballot papers? In time, it is to be hoped, that education will be so universal that such absurdities can no longer exist, but at this day, the franchise has gone far ahead of the progress of education, and Mr. Gladstone, in 1886, submitted a question involving most probably if adopted, the dismemberment of the Empire, to the decision of electors, hundreds of thousands of whom had no idea whatever of the real merits of the question at issue. If any further justification were required at our hands for the criticism to which we intend to submit Mr. Gladstone's political career, more especially so far as it is connected with the Irish question, it would be supplied by his own practical interpretation of the political principles he enunciates, as displayed in his treatment of his late Ministerial colleagues, as well as of those of his late parliamentary supporters who ventured to oppose him, which treatment was based on the supposition that he was the autocrat of the Liberal party, and that all the others should do his bidding without murmur, even though, as in 1886, he bade them ignore their election pledges, and march blindfold into the camp of the erst-while disciples of rapine.

Although by the plan we have laid down we are necessarily restricted as to space, we do not wish to curtail the part taken in the controversy by the leading actor—first, as an experimentalist, using Ireland as one of the secondary pieces on the political chess-board, and when concessions to Ireland were regarded by him mainly, if not entirely, from their bearing on the struggle for place and power in England; secondly, when Ireland resented this position, and the party of agitation had found a leader who successfully contested the matter with Mr. Gladstone, and who greatly extended the issue, and at length obtained “a complete surrender” from him. The third

act finds the British statesman—rejected on his appeal to the people—allied with his late adversaries, deserted by the leading and patriotic men of his own party, frantically opposing at the polls many of those who had long been his colleagues, railing bitterly at England, adopting the Irish policy and the tactics of the men he had so long and so rightly denounced, reversing his former professions and beliefs, advocating the disintegration of Great Britain into its constituent nationalities, bidding for Roman Catholic support by the advocacy of temporal supremacy for the Pope, and that of the Non-conformists by holding out visions of disestablishment. He cannot speak of his former political colleagues, the Tories, but in terms of contempt and disparagement. He rails at and abuses the “classes,” who are not so easily befooled as the masses. All these statements which we make can be proved, or reasonably inferred, from his own speeches or writings, whose name is legion ; and most of them will be found to be verified in these pages. Can it be a matter of surprise then, that we are in accord with a very large body of thoughtful men in the British Islands, who deny that Mr. Gladstone is either a patriot, or a great statesman, and who regard him as a most dangerous man to be entrusted with the position of political supremacy in the Empire? Before proceeding further it will be desirable to sketch briefly an outline of

MR. GLADSTONE'S POLITICAL CAREER.

He was, at the age of twenty-three, elected to the House of Commons as member for Newark, at that time a “pocket borough” under the Tory influence of the Duke of Newcastle, and it is a curious fact that his first speech in Parliament was in defence of slavery. It is but fair to state, however, that he was placed in an embarrassing position, his father having a sugar estate in Demerara, and the management of that estate having been impugned, possibly for the purpose of embroiling the young Tory member. At a much later date, however, Mr. Gladstone displayed some lingering sympathy with the cause of slaveholders, when he, being then Chancellor of the Exchequer, said that the President of the Confederate States—Mr. Jefferson Davis—“had made an army, had made a navy, and more than that, had made a nation”—a most indiscreet statement for a man in his position to make, and which was not forgotten when the Alabama and other cruisers became the subject of discussion before the arbitration tribunal at Geneva.

Another curious incident of Mr. Gladstone's early career was the publication of his book on “The State in its Relations with the Church.” We are indebted to the late Lord Macaulay

for preserving this work from oblivion by his trenchant criticism of it in the *Edinburgh Review*, since more widely known in the published volumes of "Macaulay's Essays." The critic introduces Mr. Gladstone as "a young man of unblemished character, and of distinguished parliamentary talents, the *rising hope of those stern and unbending Tories* who follow, reluctantly and mutinously, a leader* whose experience and eloquence are indispensable to them, but whose cautious temper and moderate opinions they abhor." No doubt Macaulay's criticism was of much value to the young author and politician who was the subject of it; his critic has made free use of process of reasoning known as *reductio ad absurdum*, which is to argument very much what the knife is in surgery, it cuts a fallacy clean out of the argument so that it cannot be replaced. In Macaulay's words, "Mr. Gladstone's whole theory rests on this great fundamental proposition, that the propagation of religious truth is one of the principal ends of government, as government. If Mr. Gladstone has not proved this proposition, his system vanishes at once."

We quote a passage in Mr. Gladstone's own words :—

Wherever there is a reasoning agency there is a moral duty and responsibility involved in it. The governors are reasoning agents for the nation, in their conjoint acts as such. And therefore there must be attached to this agency, as that without which none of our responsibilities can be met, a religion. And this religion must be that of the conscience of the governor or none.

This is plain speaking, but it is enlarged upon in other places. Here is another extract :—

I do not scruple to affirm, that, if a Mahometan conscientiously believes his religion to come from God, and to teach Divine truth, he must believe that truth to be beneficial, and beneficial beyond all other things, to the soul of man; and he must, therefore, and ought to, desire its extension, and to use for its extension all proper and legitimate means; and that if such Mahometan be a prince, he ought to count among these means the application of whatever influence or funds he may lawfully have at his disposal for such purposes.

It is clear from these extracts that Mr. Gladstone, up to the year 1839, was a Tory of a very extreme type indeed. Macaulay's exposure of the absurdities which would be the result of such doctrines carried out in their integrity, probably led to considerable modification of these extreme views. We have not space for a reprint of the arguments made use of, although they are amusing and instructive reading, but the essays are, or should be, accessible in any public library.

* Sir Robert Peel.

There are, however, many passages in that very able critique which show how accurately the writer gauged the idiosyncrasies of the author of the book he was reviewing, even at that early period of his life, and some of these would appear to exist to the present day, in some cases even in an exaggerated form. A few extracts by way of example will suffice :—

His mind is of large grasp ; nor is he deficient in dialectical skill. But he does not give his intellect fair play. There is no want of light, but a great want of what Bacon would have called dry light. What-
 ever Mr. Gladstone sees is *refracted and distorted by a false medium of passions and prejudices*. His style bears a remarkable analogy to his mode of thinking, and indeed exercises great influence on his mode of thinking. *His rhetoric*, though often good of its kind, *darkens and perplexes* the logic which it should illustrate. Half his acuteness and diligence, with a barren imagination and a scanty vocabulary, would have saved him from almost all his mistakes. He has one gift most dangerous to a speculator, a *vast command of a kind of language, grave and majestic, but of vague and uncertain import*.

When propositions have been established, and nothing remains but to amplify and decorate them, this dim magnificence may be in place. But if it be admitted into a demonstration, it is very much worse than absolute nonsense ; just as that transparent haze, through which the sailor sees capes and mountains of false sizes and in false bearings, is more dangerous than utter darkness. Now Mr. Gladstone is fond of employing the phraseology of which we speak in those parts of his work *which require the utmost perspicuity and precision of which human language is capable ; and in this way he deludes first himself and then his readers*. . . . The more strictly Mr. Gladstone reasons on his premises, the more absurd are the conclusions which he brings out ; and when at last his good sense and good nature recoil from the horrible practical inferences to which his theory leads, he is reduced sometimes to take refuge in arguments inconsistent with his fundamental doctrines, and sometimes to escape from the legitimate consequences of his false principles, *under cover of equally false history*.

We have placed in italics those passages which are so characteristic of Mr. Gladstone's oratory, as well as of his writings, on the Irish question at the present day. Notwithstanding his extraordinary and sudden change of front on that question, by which he divided the Liberal party after the general election of 1885, and which sudden manœuvre was probably but an abortive attempt to carry by a *coup de main* that which he must have felt conscious could not possibly pass the ordeal of full and free examination and discussion, such as would be due to a measure which proposed a most vital change in the Constitution ; one which would materially alter the relations, not only between Great Britain and Ireland, but also between the Mother Country and all the other component parts of the British Empire.*

*" In Democratic America, not the smallest amendment of the Constitution, much less an issue affecting the integrity of the nation, can be put to the vote

It was a curious irony of fate that some thirty years after the review from which we have been quoting was written, Mr. Gladstone, the author of the book reviewed, was the man found ready to disestablish the Irish Church, and later again is the leader who holds out to Nonconformists the disestablishment of the Church in Scotland and in Wales as the reward of their adhesion ; and has even been throwing out tentacles in the direction of the Church of England. We do not imply, that because a man held certain opinions at the age of thirty he must retain them at sixty or eighty ; the human mind is progressive, and Mr. Gladstone has a wonderfully active mind, but it will be generally admitted, that when remarkable mental transitions become prominent characteristics of any man, they lay him fairly open to criticism and suspicion.

We are perfectly satisfied that Mr. Gladstone was sincere when he wrote his essay on "Church and State." No doubt also his extreme views on the subject, as expressed in that essay, had undergone modification before he brought forward his proposal to disestablish

THE IRISH CHURCH ;

nevertheless, we do not believe that that action can be placed on any higher ground than a political manœuvre. Its avowed object was to pacify the Roman Catholics of Ireland by a concession to them as an act of justice. In this it utterly failed, and why ? Because it was only one of the many sops that together could have possibly led to that result, and they understood it just for what it was, a manœuvre to catch votes at the general election, and place Mr. Gladstone in power. On this subject, Mr. Froude, the historian, says, "False dice have more than once been used in playing with the fortunes of Ireland. The Liberal party needed to be re-organised, and disestablishment was a convenient subject to bring the sections of it into harmony." It is not necessary to enter into the question of the Irish Church on its merits. There was a strong *prima facie* case made out against it and no doubt Mr. Gladstone could, and would, have made a most eloquent speech in its favour had that course suited his tactics for the occasion. Mr. Froude says, "For the last fifty years there had been no body of men in the whole Empire" (referring to the clergy of that Church) "who had been doing their duty more loyally and admirably. Even the Catholic peasantry loved and trusted them. There was no cry for their disestablishment. No one

except in the most distinct and formal manner, after the most ample notice, and by a process such that consent must be the deliberate act of a decisive majority of the entire nation, represented by the Legislatures of the States."—Professor Goldwin Smith, in the *Nineteenth Century*, September, 1886.

had asked or wished for it, except perhaps the Roman Catholic hierarchy."* That was perfectly true, but Mr. Gladstone saw that it would bear fruit in Nonconformist and Roman Catholic votes, which was the political aspect of the case, and he had his reward. But looking at the question from a false point of view, he fell into a most serious blunder at the outset, a blunder which has probably led to the sacrifice of many lives, and encouraged the lawlessness and violence which it was supposed by many of its supporters the concession would tend to allay. So recently as 1865, as Mr. Gladstone has admitted, he himself regarded the Irish Church as out of the range of practical politics, that is to say, the politics of the coming election. It was held in abeyance until wanted. But in November, 1868, there was another general election, and the time had arrived for bringing that Church into the political arena, and then it became necessary to find a pretext for doing so. It happened that in 1867, a serjeant of Police named Brett had been murdered whilst conveying some Fenian prisoners to gaol at Manchester; and two months later, an attempt was made to blow up Clerkenwell prison in London, by which twelve persons were killed. The connection between these events and the Irish Church was not obvious to the unenlightened, but it afforded the required opportunity to an orator with "a vast command of grave and majestic language, of vague and uncertain import." We quote Mr. Gladstone's own words:—

When it came to this, that the great gaol in the heart of the metropolis was broken open, under circumstances which drew the attention of the English people to the state of Ireland, and when, in Manchester, policemen were murdered in the execution of their duty, at once the whole country became alive to Irish questions, and that of the Irish Church revived. It came within the range of practical politics.

How beautifully simple and clear the matter becomes when we are thus admitted behind the scenes by a great statesman. It is like the telephone exchange—the bell rings and the wires are connected by a touch of the great man's finger, and, behold! Tenterden steeple is *en rapport* with Goodwin Sands; or the Irish Church with the Fenian and Clerkenwell murderers. The unfortunate part of this matter was that some of the Fenians believed, or professed to believe, that Mr. Gladstone was speaking seriously, and they took his words to heart. In 1886 they published in the *Times*

A FENIAN MANIFESTO,

in which they justify their own tactics by quoting Mr. Glad-

* "English in Ireland," Vol. III., Supplementary Chapter, page 579.

stone's too candid admissions. They put the matter from their point of view thus :—

It was the intensity of Fenianism that, by his own admission, first enlightened Mr. Gladstone as to the iniquity of imposing on the Irish people the support and recognition of the supremacy of a Church, he tenets of which the vast majority of them did not believe, and without doubt it was the same salutary agency, combined with the action of the much maligned Ribbonmen, that impressed the same statesman with a proper sense of the enormity of the crimes of landlordism—which British law sanctioned and upheld,—and induced him to make a feeble effort to abate them. Neither is it possible to controvert the fact that the enactment of the further Gladstonian measure for the protection of the Irish tenants against landlord rapacity was directly and solely owing to the active co-operation of our brotherhood by, as it has been figuratively expressed, by “setting chapel bells ringing,” at the cost of the sacrifice of the lives of some, and the liberty of others of them.

This was, of course, ungrateful conduct on the part of the Fenians. Some seventeen years before, Mr. Gladstone, in bringing in his Disestablishment Bill (March 1st, 1869), had with that grave solemnity which he adopts to decorate his great orations, assured the House of Commons that his Government “was about to exorcise for ever the spectre of Irish discontent.” Surely that was a work for which even Hercules might have pleaded for time, but Hercules brought two rivers to bear on the Augean stables, whereas our modern Hercules trusted to his flood of oratory—which has been aptly described as a “Niagara of words,”—as the cleansing medium of Irish sedition. In the same speech above referred to, Mr. Gladstone used these words :—“I know well the punishment that follows rashness in public affairs, and that ought to fall upon those men, those Phaëtons of politics, who, with hands unequal to the task, attempt to guide the chariot of the sun.” Was this prophetic? Twenty years have expired, panacea has followed panacea, but Ireland up to the time of Mr. Gladstone's leaving office was as discontented as when he began his series of experiments in Irish legislation. We except, of course, the final surrender to the Parnellite demands when they professed satisfaction—not because the spectre of Irish discontent was exorcised, but because they had obtained an abject surrender, which, but for the unlooked for resistance of the Unionists, would have vastly improved their base of operations for further assaults.

The Irish Church Act passed, and the effect it produced on Irish disaffection was a demand for more concessions. Accordingly, in the following year, Mr. Gladstone brought forward another of his “healing measures”—the Land Bill of 1870,—in respect of which he assured the House that “peace, order, and a settled and cheerful industry, would diffuse their blessings,

from year to year, and from day to day, over a smiling land." The Bill became law, but industry did not bear a cheerful character, and the land refused to smile. An election was impending in 1873, and Mr. Gladstone's trump card was the Irish University Bill. The Irish party squeezed him so tight that it was not a matter of wonder that he devoted himself closely to Irish affairs. The new panacea for Ireland's discontent was introduced with the usual highflown language. "For the third time," he said, "he now endeavoured to discharge a duty, vital, not only to the honour and existence of the Government, but to the welfare and prosperity of Ireland." It became evident, however, that Parliament was losing faith in the government of Ireland by sops. The Bill met with little favour. The Roman Catholic hierarchy and the Irish members were those whom it was chiefly intended to conciliate, but the Roman Catholic Bishops strongly denounced the measure, and though willing to take what it offered, let it be clearly understood that they claimed much more; and the Irish members were even more dissatisfied. The Bill was thrown out on the motion for second reading by a majority of three only. Mr. Gladstone resigned, but Mr. Disraeli having declined to take office, Mr. Gladstone resumed it for a time; but in the following January (1874), he obtained a dissolution. In the ensuing election he sustained a severe defeat, the Conservatives, having a majority of 46 in the new House of Commons. Mr. Disraeli became Premier, and Mr. Gladstone, pleading age and the need of rest, retired from the active leadership of the Liberal party. Lord Hartington took command of the disorganized Opposition.

We have said that Mr. Gladstone commenced his parliamentary career in 1832 as a Tory of Tories. He held office in the short-lived Peel Ministry of 1834, and again in that of 1841, but he resigned his post in that Ministry in 1845, as he explained it, because the contemplated increase in the Maynooth endowment, and the establishment of non-sectarian colleges, were at variance with his views on the relations of the Church and the State; though soon afterwards he supported the Maynooth Improvement Bill, "as the best that could be devised to meet the present state of Ireland, and its exigencies." In January, 1846, the Peel Ministry was reorganised on the proposal to repeal the Corn Laws, and Mr. Gladstone, having by his temporary retirement gracefully purged himself of the Church and State difficulty, became Colonial Secretary in the room of Lord Stanley, who had retired. The Peel Government having repealed the Corn Laws, were forthwith defeated on their Bill for the suppression of outrage in Ireland, Mr. Gladstone not having then, or

for many years later, the horror of coercion which he now professes. In 1847 Parliament was dissolved, and at the ensuing general election Mr. Gladstone was returned, after a sharp contest, as second member for Oxford University. Two years previously his Tory principles had shown signs of softening, and now, at the meeting of Parliament, the two Tory members for Oxford University took different sides on the question of admitting Jews to Parliament, the senior member opposing, and Mr. Gladstone supporting, by speech and vote, the action of the Whig Premier, Lord John Russell, who brought forward the motion for such admission. It is not possible to fix the exact date at which Mr. Gladstone

DISCARDED HIS TORY COAT,

and assumed a brand new Whig garment. He has himself stated that so late as 1851 he had not formally left the Tory party. In December, 1852, Mr. Disraeli brought forward his Budget, the Earl of Derby being Prime Minister. Mr. Gladstone, in "a bitter and pungent speech, fiercely assailed the scheme." The Budget was carried away before this oratorical avalanche, Earl Derby resigned, Lord Aberdeen became Prime Minister, and Mr. Gladstone succeeded his rival as Chancellor of the Exchequer.

We have seen later how wonderfully Mr. Gladstone can adapt his politics to circumstances, perhaps by a natural process of evolution. We should not blame a man for the mere fact of changing his opinions; but when the process is repeated too often, and especially if the conversions are sudden, we may be allowed to suspect the motives. But when a man has been a Tory of an extreme type for say ten years, and of a modified type for other ten years, it is natural to expect that there will be some lingering regard for "auld lang syne." But Mr. Gladstone has not a single good word to say for the party who introduced him to political life; for the party of which, up to his forty-third year, he was a shining light; but he loses no opportunity of holding them up to obloquy, and his satellites promptly follow suit. To him, and to them, there is no such person or party as the Conservative; the Tory—mentally excepting Mr. Gladstone—is the only terrestrial entity that undergoes no change. He is held up to little children of the Gladstonian faith as a very terrible bogey; or, to take another simile, he is as a red rag flaunted before Gladstonian bulls to stir them up to fury. Amongst ordinary people this would be considered as wretchedly bad taste, to say the least, but perhaps there is a different standard of good taste for the guidance of great statesmen in their revolutions within the political orbit.

Mr. Gladstone has been endowed by nature with great talents, which, however, have been very much exaggerated by partisans ; he has a wonderful command of language, and has acquired great skill in the management of that talent, so as to create an effect, and serve the purpose of the moment. He is very reckless in his language, and this has led him into difficulties, as he seems at times to forget that, whatever audience he addresses, his every word will be recorded against him in type. We may here give one notable example during his election campaign in 1880. We were then in England, read the daily reports of the election meetings, and formed our opinions of Mr. Gladstone's statesmanship, which subsequent study has confirmed. In one of his Midlothian speeches he had launched out into bitter invective against Austria, for no better reason apparently than that his rival, Lord Beaconsfield, had established friendly relations with that Power ; but as the election resulted in restoring Mr. Gladstone to office as Premier, he was in the awkward position of having to explain away, as best he could, his offensive attack upon a friendly State. He seems to delight in publicity and adulation. Everything he writes, says, or does, is recorded in the Gladstonian press, and when his biography has to be compiled by an impartial historian there will be abundant materials, but it will be difficult to fit them together harmoniously. Some of Mr. Gladstone's Irish partisans, now that he has gone over to their side, are disposed to laud him in extravagantly effusive language. Here is a specimen, by Sir C. Gavan Duffy, in the *Contemporary Review* :—

They—the constituencies of England—were summoned by a voice which to wondering nations sounded like the exhortations of a prophet, and to remote posterity, when time has crowned and glorified the statesman's work, will sound like the trump of an archangel, to break with the cruel past, and do an injured people that justice which heals and rejuvenates, which blesses the giver and the receiver, &c., &c.

We think the allusion to the archangel out of place, but that to the exhortations of a prophet was more appropriate ; for we read of a certain prophet who was employed to curse Israel, and who altogether blessed them, which might be regarded as analogous to Mr. Gladstone's conduct towards the Parnellites after the election of 1885.

But there are other admirers who fall into the same error, simply from not verifying their supposed facts. A writer in the *Australasian Centennial Magazine* says :—“Mr. Gladstone made the grandest step in this direction” (that is, towards a union of sympathy, and generous regard for the weak), “when he withdrew from

THE BOER WAR

upon finding that it had, from the first, been unjust. . . . Depend upon it, the Boers are nearer the English flag by that single noble act of Gladstone's than they would be by a century of Lord Salisbury's mean and savage policy." Here the writer resorts to a common ruse amongst Gladstonians, copied from their great exemplar. "That single noble act,"—of skedaddling in the face of a triumphant foe—is held up for admiration; and then the Tory bogey is trotted out as a foil to divert attention, lest the mind should begin to ponder too intently over that "single noble act," and it might not bear the scrutiny. Let our readers judge if it will bear scrutiny. But first we give the result in the rough and ready style, as expressed on the 11th October, 1881, by Mr. John Dillon, one of Mr. Gladstone's present colleagues in Parliament :—

I heard him (Mr. Gladstone) say, in the House of Commons, that he would enter into no terms with the Dutch until the authority of the Queen was re-established in South Africa. He was beaten once, and he did not stop the war; he was beaten a second time, and he did not stop the war; he was beaten a third time at Majuba Hill, and then he gave in.

We now, as briefly as practicable, state the facts which led to the annexation of the Transvaal. Mr. Justin McCarthy, in his "History of Our Own Times," Vol. IV., page 274, speaking of Cetewayo, says :—

He was often involved in disputes with the Boers, or Dutch-descended occupants of the Transvaal Republic. Other native tribes were still more directly and often engaged in quarrels with the Boers. The Transvaal Republic made war upon one of the greatest of these African chiefs, Secocoeni, and had the worst of it in the struggle. The Republic was badly managed in every way. Its military operations were a total failure; its exchequer was ruined; there seemed hardly any chance of maintaining order within its frontier, and the prospect appeared at the time to be that its South African enemies would overrun the whole of the Republic; would thus come up to the borders of the English States, and possibly might soon involve the English settlers themselves in war.

This state of affairs led some of the Transvaal settlers to propose annexation to England, and the British Government, naturally anxious to consolidate their territory, and put a stop to the constant irregular warfare between the Boers and the native tribes, sent out Sir Theophilus Shepstone to investigate. The author from whose book we have quoted thinks this gentleman was entirely mistaken, and "acting under the impression that the Boers were willing to accept English authority, he boldly, one might say lawlessly, declared the Republic a portion of the dominions of Great Britain." Other writers state that Sir Theophilus Shepstone was not

mistaken as to the general desire of the Boers, although there were no doubt some dissentients, and from the condition of their affairs described in the foregoing extract, it would appear that annexation was the best, and perhaps the only way out of their difficulties. Be this as it may, the annexation took place in the month of April, 1877, Lord Beaconsfield being then Prime Minister.

The "History of Our Own Times" closes with the year 1879, and does not allude to our relations with the Boers subsequent to the annexation. Two years later they were undoubtedly claiming restoration of their independence, but circumstances were much changed.

A POWERFUL BASUTO CHIEF, SECOCOENI,

had formerly defeated them, and driven them from his country. In 1878, Colonel Rowlands, V.C., with a British force of 450 infantry and 430 cavalry, with 6 guns, failed to compel his submission, and owing to drought and want of forage had to retire, harrassed by Secocoeni, who had 5,000 fighting men under his command; but in May, 1879, Sir Garnet Wolseley was sent out to assume the position of "Commander-in-Chief of the forces in South Africa, and as High Commissioner for Natal, the Transvaal, and the neighbouring countries." He reached Natal about the end of June. At this time, consequent on the war with the Zulus, there were at the seat of war, 20,000 British troops, besides about 800 seamen and marines, and upwards of 4,000 colonial forces. On the 4th July, Lord Chelmsford fought a decisive battle at Ulundi, which practically terminated the war; but Cetewayo, the Zulu King, was still at large. Sir Garnet arrived on the borders of Zululand on the very day of the victory. He then made arrangements for following up and capturing Cetewayo, which in the broken country, well known to the retreating King and his followers, was no easy task, but it resulted in the capture of Cetewayo on the 28th of August. Usibebe and all the other chiefs of note forthwith submitted to the authority of the Queen. Having made necessary arrangements for the dismemberment of Zululand into thirteen territories, and for their government, Sir Garnet turned his attention to the Transvaal, and on the 13th September he arrived at Wakkerstroom, and on the 27th at Pretoria. "Here and elsewhere on the road, when addressing gatherings of Boers, he stated to them that the act of annexation was irrevocable; and 'at Standerton, on the Vaal River, he told the people that the sun would cease to shine, and the Vaal would flow backwards through the Drakenburg, before the British would withdraw from their country.' He promised that everything should be done to satisfy their just

requirements, short of independence ; but the Boer Committee, numbering 70 members, replied by a resolution, that nothing could satisfy them but the retrocession of their country.* There were at that time in the Transvaal five battalions of infantry, two batteries of artillery and the 1st Dragoon Guards ; but two battalions of foot and a battery were under orders to leave the country later in the year, and half of the remaining battery was to be removed to Natal. On the 29th September, 1879, Sir Garnet Wolseley issued a proclamation, announcing "that it is the will and determination of Her Majesty's Government that the Transvaal Territory shall be, and shall continue to be for ever, an integral part of Her Majesty's dominions in South Africa."

In October, the Boers, finding their demands unheeded, began to give trouble ; a large body of them made a threatening demonstration against British rule at Middelburg, and being refused permission to purchase ammunition, seized it, leaving payment on the counter with the storekeeper. In consequence of the difficulty of collecting taxes in a sparsely peopled country, orders had been given that no permit for the purchase of ammunition should be granted unless the applicant could produce his receipt for taxes. The Boers committed other riotous acts, but dispersed on the arrival of Sir Garnet Wolseley, though similar acts were committed at Potchefstroom.

Secocoeni had beaten the Boers, and had also, as we have stated, beaten off a detachment of our forces (in which, however, he was aided by drought and the scarcity of forage), and he failed to understand that circumstances had changed to his disadvantage ; so he trusted to the strength of his mountain fastnesses, and disregarded an ultimatum sent to him requiring his submission and the payment of a fine of 2,500 head of cattle, and his consent to a military force being stationed in his territory, warning him also that he would share the fate of Cetewayo unless he recognised the authority of the Queen. Negotiations having failed, General Wolseley now took measures to reduce this chief to submission. For this purpose, 1,400 British infantry, 400 colonial horse, and 10,000 natives were employed in two divisions, the western of which, under Colonel Baker Russell, the General accompanied in person. It is not necessary to narrate here the details of the campaign, for which we must refer the reader to Mr. Low's book, already quoted ; it is in one volume, price six shillings, and will be found both interesting and instructive. The plan was carried

*"Life of Lord Wolseley," by Charles Rathbone Low, I.N., F.R.G.S. (London, Richard Bently and Son), page 372, to which we are indebted for most of the facts of this outline.

out almost literally as it had been mapped out by General Wolseley in his despatches, and the climax was exact, for he had concluded his letter to each of his correspondents with the assurance that he would take his afternoon tea in Secocoeni's house on the 28th November; these letters were written from Pretoria, in the Transvaal, before starting for the campaign on the 28th October,—“*and the afternoon of the 28th November saw him in Secocoeni's mansion.*”

Having arrived at this date—28th November, 1879—we must now return from this digression and enquire what was going on in England affecting the interests of the South African dependencies. On the 25th November, just three days before Secocoeni's enforced submission, Mr. Gladstone had gone

ON THE WAR PATH.

He had, it will be remembered, been defeated on his appeal to the electors in 1874, and had resigned the leadership of the Liberal Party some months later (January, 1875), in a letter to Lord Granville, which contained the following explanation of his reasons:—“I see no public advantage in my continuing to act as the leader of the Liberal Party; and, at the age of sixty-five, and after forty-two years of a laborious public life, I think myself entitled to retire on the present opportunity. This retirement is dictated to me by my personal views as to the best method of spending the closing years of my life.” . . . Lord Hartington was shortly afterwards elected leader, and under him the party had been reorganised and refreshed in readiness for the fray when the dissolution should take place. This did not occur till the 8th of March, 1880, but Mr. Gladstone having decided not to seek re-election for Greenwich, had determined to woo “dear old Scotland,” and had fixed upon Midlothian as the constituency, but he had anticipated the dissolution, and started on his first Midlothian campaign on November 25th. Having convinced himself, and persuaded many of his followers, that he is the greatest statesman of the day, it was only natural that he should condemn Lord Beaconsfield, who had for five years usurped his seat, for their policy differed essentially,—Lord Beaconsfield's being an Imperial policy of building up and strengthening the Empire; whilst Mr. Gladstone had favoured that which has been described as the “cut the painter” policy; the colonies being regarded by him as expensive appendages, which should be expected to set up for themselves. Therefore, of course, everything Lord Beaconsfield had done, he regarded it as his bounden duty to undo as far as possible; and, regardless of the effect he might create outside the interests of the coming election, he

commenced on that day an election contest, during which he vigorously denounced Lord Beaconsfield and all his works, including, *inter alia*, the annexation of the Transvaal. According to him, the Boers were a very badly-used people indeed. They loved liberty, more especially the liberty of appropriating the enforced labour of the native tribes whose territory they had annexed—but this “domestic institution” was not in accordance with British prejudices, and they were actually expected to abandon it. We found them bankrupt, and their position and conduct a serious danger to Natal, and the friendly native tribes. They were between the Zulus, with an army of 40,000 braves, and Secocoeni with a smaller force, but sufficient to thrash them. These we subdued, lest, during their contests with the Boers, our colonists might become involved in the “washing of spears.” Having done so much in their behalf, the Boers thought it was time we cleared out of the Transvaal, and gave them a free hand with the natives, whom they required as servants. Mr. Gladstone came to their aid, and his denunciation of the annexation was quite cheering to their depressed spirits. But Mr. Gladstone had not as yet displaced his rival, though he was working up the electors to the required degree of tension. We were at war in Afghanistan, consequent on the massacre of our Mission—Sir Louis Cavagnari and his suite—at Cabul. This is what Mr. Gladstone said of the war :—

It is written in the eternal laws of the universe of God that sin shall be followed by suffering. An unjust war is a tremendous sin. The question which you have to consider is whether this war is just or unjust. So far as I am able to collect the evidence it is unjust. It fills me with the greatest alarm lest it should be proved to be grossly and totally unjust, etc.

THESE PIOUS EXHORTATIONS

are very telling with the electors ; they like to be taken into confidence, and consulted as to the religious bearing of the question, and then it seems reasonable that the man who is familiar with the eternal laws of the Supreme Ruler must be the right man to take office in this lower sphere.

Mr. Gladstone having so publicly expressed his sympathy with the Boers, they adopted the prudent plan of protesting, so long as Sir Garnet Wolseley was present with a force they had no hope of resisting with success ; but they were urged by the *Volkstein*, the Boer organ in Pretoria, to quietly disperse and await the departure of his Excellency and the troops, which advice they followed. Mr. Gladstone became Prime Minister on April 28th, 1880. Perhaps this was the punishment the nation had incurred for its sins ; it has certainly brought much evil upon it. The Boers expected the time had

come to grant all their demands, but Mr. Gladstone in office has some sense of responsibility, and he said that he would not make terms with them until the Queen's authority was re-established in the Transvaal. But, according to Mr. Gladstone's apologist in the *Centennial Magazine*, he withdrew from the Boer War on finding that it had, from the first, been unjust. But, in 1879, he had denounced the annexation as unjust, and if so, why did he, in 1881, refuse to make terms until the authority of the Queen was re-established? Why re-establish an authority, if that authority was an unjust usurpation which he was prepared to reverse? It is no good playing fast and loose with the question; either the British Government were right or wrong in annexing the Transvaal in 1877. If Mr. Gladstone did not know which—right or wrong—what could justify him in denouncing it as wrong in 1879, and again in the early part of 1880? If he did know that the British were wrong, why refuse to consider the question until a wrongful authority was re-established by force? But if we were right—and there is much to be said on that side, even if Sir Theophilus Shepstone made a mistake as to the consent of the Boers—if we were right, then Mr. Gladstone encouraged the Boers by denouncing our action as wrong; he endeavoured to re-establish the Queen's authority without an adequate force, and when our small detachments were beaten, and at Majuba Hill our general, Sir George Colley, and most of the men with him, were shot down; then, if we were right, why did the Gladstone Government yield? His apologist says it was a noble act, because Mr. Gladstone withdrew from the Boer War "on finding" that it had, from the first, been unjust. So he said in effect in his election speeches, 1879-80; why then was Sir George Colley contending with the Boers in 1881? "An unjust war is a tremendous sin," so Mr. Gladstone told the electors of Greenwich, November 30, 1879. If the Boer War was an unjust war, who is more responsible for it than the Prime Minister who had denounced the grounds of it, yet did not stop it until many lives had been sacrificed? On whom then rests the "tremendous sin?" If Mr. Gladstone was so well informed of the state of affairs in South Africa as to justify his emphatic denunciations and criticisms at election meetings, where his audiences naturally looked to him for truthful information, and not mere sensational but unreliable criticisms, then it was his duty on taking office to see that he had a force at Natal and the Transvaal sufficient to carry out his policy; but certainly not to profess to re-establish the Queen's authority with inadequate means. He seems to have repeated the same blunder that the Aberdeen-Gladstone Ministry of 1854 fell into when they commenced the Crimean

War without due preparations. Our troops could not be withdrawn in the face of Russia and in presence of our allies, or the "skedaddle" policy would probably have been tried. This reminds us of another article by Sir C. Gavan Duffy, in which he falls again into notable error. Writing in the *Contemporary Review* of May, 1886, he says, referring to the Home Rule scheme of that year :—

His late colleagues are persuaded that Mr. Gladstone has made a fatal mistake. I remember one of his "fatal mistakes" thirty years ago, which gives me other hopes. The man sitting next me in the House of Commons nudged me one evening, and whispered that "Gladstone was going to commit political suicide." He made one of the most cogent and persuasive speeches it ever has been my fortune to hear against the Crimean War He performed on that occasion one of the highest functions of a man of genius—he anticipated opinion by a decade.

ABOUT THE CRIMEAN WAR,

the less said the better on the part of Mr. Gladstone's admirers, although it is wonderful how easily a great many people are led by Mr. Gladstone's orations. Here is a man of some standing in Australia, who has been Prime Minister of Victoria, and who of late years has contributed several articles to one at least of the leading reviews, and from whom we have, therefore, a right to expect some care in the statements he puts forward as historical facts. A little care would have exposed the fallacy contained in the above extract, which he seems to have so readily given credence to, and retained for thirty years. He did not give the date of the speech referred to, but we shall be able readily to identify it, briefly recalling the circumstances under which the British nation entered upon the Crimean War. We refer readers who wish to study a well condensed narrative of those events to Mr. Justin McCarthy's "History of Our Own Times," vol. II.

In 1844, the Emperor Nicholas of Russia visited England, when he had several conversations with the late Earl of Aberdeen, then Foreign Secretary, and other members of the Ministry, on the subject of Turkey, and what would be likely to happen in case of her dissolution. The English Ministry do not seem to have treated these communications as of much importance, and the Czar, assuming perhaps that silence implied consent, spoke freely of his plans, and his desire that Russia and England should be prepared for an emergency which might arise at any time, and he wished the two Powers to act in concert. On his return to St. Petersburg the Czar had a memorandum drawn up by his Chancellor, embodying the views which, according to his impressions, were entertained alike by himself and by the British statesmen with whom he

had conversed on the matter. It was stated also that Austria and Russia had already a mutual understanding. In January, 1853, the Emperor renewed this subject in conversation with Sir Hamilton Seymour, our Minister at St. Petersburg. He explained his plans more fully, and was evidently under the impression that the interests of England and Russia were united in the transaction. The British Government had laid aside the Memorandum of 1844, and did not approve of thus disposing of the goods of the Sick Man, as the Czar designated Turkey, and they would not be parties to this clandestine arrangement.

Although the Emperor of Russia had shown his hand, under a mistaken idea that England was in accord with him, he had formed his plans and was not willing to draw back; but probably had not up to the last expected that England would take up arms to restrain him. On the 4th of October, 1853, Turkey declared war against Russia. On the 12th, Mr. Gladstone (being then Chancellor of the Exchequer) attended the inauguration of a statue to Sir R. Peel, at Manchester. The war excitement was becoming warm, and meetings for and against it were being held throughout the country. Mr. Gladstone, of course, alluded to it in his speech. He spoke of the designs of Russia, describing her as—

A power which threatened to override all the others, and to prove a source of danger to the peace of the world. This disastrous state of affairs would be precipitated by the overthrow of the Ottoman Empire, and against this result England had determined to set herself at whatever cost.

He went on to deprecate war, and said,

Her Majesty's Ministers had persevered in exercising that self-restraint which impatience may mistake for indifference, feebleness, or cowardice, but which are truly the crowning greatness of a great people, and do not evince a want of readiness to vindicate, when the time comes, the honour of this country . . . Already the popular voice was beginning to make itself heard, charged with indignation against Russia, and *clamouring for active measures in support of Turkey.*

On the 28th March, 1854, England declared war against Russia, Mr. Gladstone being still Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Aberdeen Prime Minister; and it is a significant fact Lord Palmerston had assumed, for the first time, the position of Home Secretary. It is clear, then, that the speech referred to by Sir C. Gavan Duffy must have been subsequent to this declaration of war, to which Mr. Gladstone must have been a consenting party, as he continued in the Ministry. We would here remark that the late Mr. John Bright, who, as a Quaker, was opposed to all war, had made several eloquent speeches against that war, though he was opposing popular will in so

doing. Therefore, it was Mr. Bright who "anticipated opinion by a decade," but for doing so he was burnt in effigy, and also lost his seat as M.P. for Manchester! May he not have been right, also, in his opposition to Mr. Gladstone on his Irish Bill? Mr. Bright also was opposed to the bombarding of Alexandria, and left Mr. Gladstone's Ministry on that account. The following quotation from Mr. G. B. Smith's "Life of W. E. Gladstone," page 154, shows the undecided state of mind which led to the country

"DRIFTING INTO WAR."

It should be borne in mind, in estimating the responsibilities of Ministers at this period, that the tone of the public mind of England was hurrying them forward with surprising rapidity. Lord Aberdeen and Mr. Gladstone were both averse to war. The former had indeed a holy horror of war in the abstract, and he was especially averse to a war with Russia, not only by reason of the impressions of his early life, but because of the relations of mutual esteem which had long existed between the Emperor Nicholas and himself; he also anticipated evil to Europe by a forcible breaking up of the ties established by the Congress of Vienna, and riveted by the Peace of Paris. The Premier had, in fact, gone so far in the early stage of the Eastern difficulty as to resolve not to remain at the head of the Government unless he could maintain peace. The only phrase to describe his policy at this period is that he "drifted" into war. He did not wish it, he deplored it; and yet he was gradually borne on towards it, without being able to take the retrograde steps he desired.

The historian goes on to show that Mr. Gladstone was equally averse to war, on humanitarian and on national grounds as well as on the ground of cost; and then he quotes a passage from Mr. Kinglake to show that his "more than common liveliness of conscience" helped to drag him into the mischief. This lively conscience, of which we hear so frequently, is not to be relied on when its owner's latest opinions are diametrically opposed to former denunciations, such, for instance, as his present palliation of boycotting, with that expressed in his speech in Parliament, May 24th, 1882. It will be seen, from the statement of a most friendly biographer, that the two leading statesmen of the Cabinet in 1854 were drifting on the waves of popular clamour directly towards the maelstrom of war, but catching at passing straws to save them from the vortex. But Sir C. Gavan Duffy tells us his "man of genius" made a most cogent and persuasive speech against this war. So he did, after the turn of the tide; and it is worth while devoting some space to the elucidation of that matter, because the survivor of those two drifting statesmen is the same who has drifted the nation into the Irish embroglio, which culminated in 1886, and now claims to be the only man who can drift it out again. Mr. Gladstone's cogent and persuasive speech must have been one he made on the 24th May, 1855.

The disastrous mismanagement of the arrangements of the war at the outset, and the consequent fearful sufferings of our troops during the winter of 1854, are too well-known for it to be necessary here to give more than a bare outline of the facts. It will be remembered that Mr. Roebuck brought forward, in the House of Commons, a motion for the appointment of a select committee to enquire into the condition of our army before Sebastopol, and into the conduct of those departments of the Government whose duty it has been to minister to the wants of that army. The war correspondents had been sending home very depressing accounts of the sufferings and losses consequent on the breakdown of the supplies, and public feeling in England had *undergone a complete reaction*, and was now eager for a change of Ministry, and for placing Lord Palmerston at the head of affairs, as the only member of the Government who thoroughly knew his own purpose; who was, in fact, not merely "drifting." He believed from the first that the pretensions of Russia could only be put down by force of arms, and he thought the time had arrived to carry out what he held to be inevitable. Lord John Russell, who was leader of the House of Commons, was unwilling that Mr. Roebuck's motion should be resisted, but as he differed from his colleagues, he resigned office. Lord Palmerston resisted the motion, though most people thought that the chief blame arose from the control of the war not having been given into his hands. Mr. Gladstone said "the inquiry could lead to nothing but confusion and disturbance, increased disasters, shame at home and weakness abroad; and would carry malignant joy to the hearts of the enemies of England." The result of the division on Mr. Roebuck's motion was a majority of no less than one hundred and fifty-seven against Ministers, and the Government of course resigned. Lord Derby first, and then Lord John Russell, having failed to form an administration, Lord Palmerston was intrusted with the task. Mr. Gladstone, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Sidney Herbert, who constituted the Peelite section of the late Coalition Ministry, returned to office. The new Ministry did not give universal satisfaction, as it contained, irrespective of the Premier, five members of the late rejected administration, and on this ground it met with considerable opposition in the House of Commons. Mr. Roebuck still claimed the appointment of his committee forthwith, the country supported him, and in consequence, Mr. Gladstone, Sir James Graham, and Mr. Sidney Herbert, who *had been credited with a desire to patch up a premature peace*, again retired from office. This was in February, 1855. On the 2nd of March the Emperor Nicholas died, and this event gave rise to a hope of, and led to negotiations for peace; and a

Conference was opened at Vienna, at which Lord John Russell represented the interests of England. Sardinia at this time joined in the war as the ally of England and France. On the 24th May, Mr. Disraeli, as leader of the Opposition, brought forward a resolution in the House of Commons, deprecating the uncertain attitude of the Government on the question of peace or war, and declaring that—

Under these circumstances, this House feels it a duty to declare that it will continue to give every support to Her Majesty in the prosecution of the war, until Her Majesty shall, in conjunction with her allies, obtain for this country a safe and honourable peace.

On the same day, May 24th, Mr. Gladstone spoke on this motion, and, according to Sir C. Gavan Duffy, he

“ANTICIPATED OPINION BY A DECADE.”

He denied that the war had been completely unsuccessful, and argued that Russia had yielded some of the points in dispute, and he continued—

The only matter to be settled now was, as to the limitation of the power of Russia in the Black Sea. When a member of the late Government, he was in favour of limiting the power of Russia in the Black Sea, but he now thought that such a proposition implied a great indignity upon Russia. He was of opinion that the Russian proposal to give Turkey the power of opening and shutting the Straits was one calculated to bring about a settlement. . . . He felt that he would be incurring a fearful responsibility if he did not raise his voice to beseech the House to pause before they persevered in a war so bloody and so decimating, while there was a chance of returning to the condition of a happy and an honourable peace. If we now fought merely for military success, let the House look at this sentiment with the eye of reason, and it would appear immoral, inhuman, and un-Christian. If the war were continued in order to obtain military glory, we should tempt the justice of Him in whose hands was the fate of armies, to launch upon us His wrath.

This must have been the speech referred to by Sir C. Gavan Duffy in such extravagantly laudatory terms. During the whole war, up to the 10th of February, Mr. Gladstone had been a member of the Government that was responsible for it, so he could not have made the speech referred to earlier than February, 1855. We can find nothing else that will answer to a denunciation during the intervening three months, but, indeed, it matters little. Mr. Gladstone was, perhaps, like his chief, Lord Aberdeen, unwillingly drifted into war; but he was a free agent, a member and an active and prominent member of the Government that undertook the war, and made such a fearful mess of the management of it. The war was in its early stage very popular, and Mr. Gladstone did not display the statesmanship attributed to him by denouncing it then. When Lord Palmerston was installed at the head of affairs,

and things were being put in order, Mr. Gladstone, having a keen eye upon that barometer which regulates so many of his actions—that known as popular applause,—had no difficulty in discovering that a reaction had taken place in public sentiment, consequent on the disclosures made by the war correspondents in the Crimea; and, in conjunction with two of his colleagues, having unsuccessfully opposed the appointment of the Committee of Inquiry, resigned. Three months later we find him denouncing the war which he had formerly blessed. His speech, from which we have quoted, adopts the characteristic “grave and majestic” style; it was garnished also with the pious element, or that which appears so to that section of his admirers who prefer to think by proxy; an invocation of “Him in whose hands was the fate of armies,” and deprecation of His wrath if we continued to follow to its legitimate end that line of policy which, on the 12th October, 1853, in Manchester, the same speaker had declared England had determined to follow at whatever cost, viz:—to defeat the designs of Russia to overthrow the Ottoman Empire. We do not enter into the question of the policy or otherwise of the Crimean War; probably the results attained proved too transient to be worth the sacrifices made for their attainment. England was unprepared for war, and she failed both in her statesmanship, and to some extent in her generalship; but her troops maintained her honour, and their own. We maintain, however, that Mr. Gladstone’s vaunted speech of May 24th, 1855, so far from displaying any wonderful genius, was simply a rehearsal of that “skedaddle” policy which on a smaller scale he has practised in the Transvaal little war. In the Crimea we could not have pretended a “generous regard for the weak” as an excuse for backing out. The late Prince Albert, writing to Lord Aberdeen, used these words—

Any such declaration as Mr. Gladstone has made upon Mr. Disraeli’s motion must not only weaken us abroad in public estimation, and give a wrong opinion as to the determination of the nation to support the Queen in the war in which she has been involved, but render all chance of obtaining an honourable peace without great fresh sacrifices of blood and treasure impossible, by giving new hopes and spirit to the enemy.*

Sir E. B. Lytton was vehemently cheered when he asked, during the same debate—

When Mr. Gladstone was dwelling, in a Christian spirit that moved them all, on the gallant blood that had been shed by England, by her allies, and by her foemen in that quarrel, did it never occur to

* G. Barnett Smith’s “Life of W. E. Gladstone,” page 187.

him that all the time he was speaking, this one question was forcing itself upon the minds of his English audience, "*And shall all this blood have been shed in vain?*"*

We have devoted much time and space to an analysis of two or three of the extravagant laudations, typical of the style in which Mr. Gladstone's most obvious failures are viewed by his partisans and admirers. It would not be difficult to multiply examples, but we return from this digression to the Irish question. We flatter ourselves we have lifted the "mean and savage policy" off the shoulders of Lord Salisbury.

BOYCOTTING.

LONDON telegrams of April 5th, 1889, to the Australasian press, stated as follows:—"In his address to-day, before the *Times* Parnell Commission, Sir Charles Russell justified the system of boycotting, with limits, and gave as an instance the Australian Governments boycotting Government officials until the deporting of convicts ceased." Sir Charles was slightly out in his geography, as the incident occurred at the Cape. It will be found that the Cape boycotting was a very harmless affair, which could have been defeated without much difficulty if it had involved an issue of a very vital character. We give the incident in the words of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, in one of his contributions on the Irish question to the *Contemporary Review*, May, 1886.

In the Cape the system now known as boycotting had its origin. The Colonists starved the Governor and his Executive into submission on the question of admitting convicts. They did not fight, because they were too few for physical resistance; but they paralyzed the Executive by a social insurrection, in which they refused to supply meat, drink, or service of any character. Briton and Boer emulated each other in this work. They completely succeeded; convicts were withdrawn; they got a Legislature to express their wishes by more legitimate methods; and, finally, when they had become sufficiently numerous, they got Responsible Government.

Elsewhere we have quoted Mr. Gladstone's denunciation of boycotting in May, 1882. His words, as reported in *Hansard*, were, "the sanction of boycotting, that which stands in the rear

* G. Barnett Smith's "Life of W. E. Gladstone," page 188.

of boycotting, and by which alone boycotting can in the long run be made thoroughly effective, is the murder which is not to be denounced." More recently, that is, since his alliance with the Parnellites, he has found it necessary to convince himself that boycotting is simply "exclusive dealing."

Boycotting was introduced in Ireland by Mr. Parnell, the occasion being a speech at Ennis, on the 19th day of September, 1880. It did not as yet bear the name by which it has attained such unenviable notoriety; it derived that, not from its paternity, but from its first victim, Captain Boycott. Mr. Parnell, on the occasion in question, was addressing a meeting chiefly composed of tenant farmers; he said—

Now, you will ask me, what must be done to a tenant who takes a farm from which another man has been sent away?

Some of the audience cried out, "Shoot him."

Mr Parnell continued:—I think that some of you answer, "Shoot him!" But I will point out to you another method, which is much more certain, and which has the advantage of being more Christian and more charitable, for it gives the sinner time to repent. When a man has taken a farm from which another has been unjustly driven out, you must, by your conduct, wherever you meet him, by the isolation in which you will force him to live, by treating him as formerly lepers were treated—you must, I repeat, by all these measures, show him the hatred and contempt you feel for his crime.

It will be observed that this very "Christian and charitable" method leaves to the illiterate people he was addressing the decision as to when a previous tenant has been "unjustly" driven out. He tells them it is a crime to take a farm from which another has been (in their eyes) unjustly ejected, and deprecates murder in favour of boycotting, which "is much more certain as well as more Christian," etc. This is a man with whom Mr. Gladstone for more than three years has been in alliance. Mr. Gladstone is not ignorant of the real nature of boycotting as practised in Ireland. He has denounced it in the strongest terms when he had the responsibilities of office. We have quoted one of his speeches, in which he said that the real sanction of boycotting is murder. In the same speech, on the 24th of May, 1882, he disposed of the "exclusive dealing" pretext, which is of course but an excuse for that which is inexcusable. In reply to an interruption by Mr. Dillon, he said—

Exclusive dealing is a totally different thing. That has nothing to do with combined intimidation exercised for the purpose of inflicting ruin, and driving men to do what they do not want to do. That is illegal, and that is the illegality recommended by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Dillon).

We now quote the opinion of boycotting which the author of "Chez Paddy," the Baron E. de Mandat Grancey, formed, and he took care to acquaint himself with the facts, and devoted many pages to the narration of his experiences. He says (page 253)—

Boycotting has become so common in Ireland that gradually a kind of jurisprudence has been introduced into its application. Thus there is a first degree of boycotting which is not applied directly to persons. A refractory landlord finds his produce or his property interdicted. He can neither let the one nor sell the other. Usually, he hastens to yield, apologises, pays a fine, and things remain as they were. But if he still resists, the measures taken against him begin to assume a more personal character. He can no longer buy anything that he may require, for whoever sells anything to him, or renders him any service, is at once excommunicated. Until then the League takes the whole responsibility of its actions. Its sentences are often placarded. In every case they are announced in the party newspapers. It is not until the series of mutilations of cattle, arson, and attempts at murder, which form the third degree of boycotting, commences, that it always disclaims all responsibility.

In another place (page 44 *et seq.*), the same writer says—

Boycotting cannot exist unless it is effective, and it cannot be effective unless all those who are charged with carrying it out are placed under strict discipline. A rich man who is boycotted would evidently try to induce the butcher or the baker to furnish him with provisions. He would, if possible, offer them large sums to tempt them to yield. In order that this butcher or baker should resist their offers, they must know that their disobedience will expose them to serious danger.

Boycotting, therefore, entails absolute discipline, and since there can be no discipline without authority, it ends in intimidation. Now, from intimidation to murder there is only one step. The facts prove it. Mr. Parnell often repeats that the only day that he despaired of the future, and was on the point of renouncing the struggle, was when he received the news of the murders at Phoenix Park. This is very possible; but still Mr. Parnell cannot deny that his system could not work two days if murders had not been committed. He blames the assassins, but profits by their deeds.

We would ask all those who talk or write flippantly about granting Home Rule to Ireland, to ponder over the next extract, which follows the above on page 44. Do they realise that they are giving encouragement to rebellion, supported by secret atrocities though not by open war?

We must, however, acknowledge that the question can be looked at from another side. It is certain that the Irish people are in a state of war or of rebellion, whichever you like, against England. This is incontestable. The war is carried on by extraordinary means, but still it is war. Mr. Parnell is therefore the chief of a belligerent army. He has regular troops, namely, the official agents of the Land League; and then he has irregular troops, composed of men who all aim at the same thing, but who will not submit to any discipline, and who advance towards their end by whichever road they fancy will lead them the most directly.

We are not prepared to endorse this opinion as emphatically as it is expressed by the writer. His statement of the case, however, puts strongly before us for consideration, whether, on the British side, we are not placed at a great disadvantage for want of some clear definition of the status of the National League as opposed to us. They claim to be a political party in opposition, and would probably refuse to admit that they are carrying on war against us. Certain it is that their position is very anomalous, and Great Britain is, we believe, the only Power which would have allowed such a long continued series of aggressive acts to be dealt with so leniently. When members or agents of the League commit any crime, and are dealt with accordingly as criminals and sent to gaol, there is of late an outcry raised, regarding it as a grievance that they should be treated as criminals, and not as political prisoners. If a policeman is killed in the execution of his duty, by persons who were incited by the National League to boycott some person whom that policeman is employed to protect in support of the law of the land, the killing of such a policeman is either murder, or an act of warfare, assuming that it is done intentionally, or is the result of any other felonious act. Now, if the criminal is to be dealt with as a "political offender," and more leniently than an ordinary criminal, it is time that the code of political offences should be more strictly defined. When a state of open war exists, and is recognised as such, prisoners are then dealt with as prisoners of war; they are detained to deprive the enemy of their services, and imprisoned or paroled to prevent escape, but the idea of both parties sitting in the same Parliament, and carrying on the business of law-making during civil war, is absurd. They are belligerents engaged in civil war, or they are in a conspiracy to deprive some of the Queen's subjects of their land, or their rents, or other legal rights.

We have now given Mr. Gladstone's opinions on boycotting—firstly, from the point of view of Prime Minister of England, when he said—"Mr. Parnell was a living proof that the state of things in Ireland was coming to a question between law on the one side, and sheer lawlessness on the other;" and in the same speech "warned him that the resources of civilisation were not yet exhausted;" and, secondly, when finding the resources of civilisation, wielded by his irresolute and vacillating hands, had become unequal to the task of maintaining law and order, he had thrown the weight of his influence into the scale of "the reckless and chaotic schemes they have devised" (to quote his own words at Liverpool, on the 27th of October, 1881). We have also described boycotting in the words of a French naval officer and impartial onlooker anxious to arrive at the truth.

We now take a few extracts from the work of Mr. Wm. Henry Hurlbert. It is called,

“IRELAND UNDER COERCION :

the Diary of an American.” From a notice in the *Edinburgh Review* of October last, we extract some remarks as to the book and its author :*—

In our judgment, we are indebted to Mr. Hurlbert for incomparably the most able, impartial, and interesting contribution to the discussion of the great problem of the government and social condition of Ireland which has been given to the world. . . . Mr. Hurlbert is a traveller and politician of a high order. He brings with him not only the same sympathy with the Roman Catholic Church as Baron De Mandat Grancey [who had been previously referred to by the writer], but an intimate acquaintance with political parties in America and in Europe; . . . a knowledge of life extending across the globe from Mexico to Palestine, a familiar acquaintance with all that is best in the society of America and of Europe, more especially of France, Italy, and England; an experience gained in the rough school of civil war, and a penetrating observation of the secret revolutionary forces which are at work in more than one part of the world. If the style is light the matter is weighty, and we believe that there is no book in existence in which so accurate a survey of Ireland at the present time can be found as in these two volumes. We most earnestly commend them to our readers, and we trust they will be read both in England and America as much as they deserve to be.

The coercion referred to in the title of this book is not that enforcement of the law of which Nationalist and Gladstonian writers complain so bitterly, but that coercion which is applied by the irresponsible agents of illegal societies to enforce their own “reckless and chaotic schemes.” Of the former coercion, Mr. Hurlbert writes :—

Of the coercion under which the Nationalist speakers and writers ask us in America to believe that the Island groans and travails, I have seen literally nothing. Nowhere in the world is the press more absolutely free than to-day in Ireland. Nowhere are the actions of men in authority more bitterly and unsparingly criticised.

At Abbeylisle, near Kilkenny, Mr. Hurlbert says :—

At dinner the party was joined by several residents of the county. One of them gave me his views of the working of the

“PLAN OF CAMPAIGN.”

It is a plan, he maintains, not of defence against unjust and exacting landlords, but of offence against “landlordism,” not really promoted, as it appears to be, in the interests of the tenants, to whose cupidity it appeals, but worked from Dublin as a battering engine against law and order in Ireland. Every case in which it is applied needs, he thinks, to be looked into on its own merits. It will then be found precisely why this or that spot has been selected by the League for attack. At Luggacullen, for instance, the Plan of Campaign has been imposed upon the

* Since the above was written we have received this work, a most valuable addition to the literature of this controversy.

tenants because the property belongs to the Marquis of Lansdowne, who happens to be Governor-General of Canada, so that to attack him is to attack the Government. The rents of the Lansdowne property at Luggacurren, this gentleman offers to prove to me, are not, and never have been excessive; and Lord Lansdowne has expended very large sums in improving the property, and for the benefit of the tenants. Two of the largest tenants having got into difficulties through reckless racing and other forms of extravagance, found it convenient to invite the League into Luggacurren, and compel other tenants in less embarrassed circumstances to sacrifice their holdings, by refusing to pay rents which they knew to be fair, and were abundantly able and eager to pay. At Mitchelstown, the Plan of Campaign was aimed again, not at the Countess of Kingston the owner, but at the Disestablished Protestant Church of Ireland, the trustees of which hold a mortgage of a quarter of a million sterling on the estates. On the Clanricarde property, in Galway, the Plan has been introduced, my informant says, because Lord Clanricarde happens to be personally unpopular. Go down to Portumna and Woodford, he said, and you will find that the rents on the Clanricarde estates are in the main exceptionally fair, and even low.

To Portumna, accordingly, Mr. Hurlbert went, and was courteously received by Mr. Tener, the Marquis's agent, who explained to him the offers which had been made to the tenants and rejected by them. The following narrative of an interview between Mr. Tener and two of the tenants is instructive.

February 29.—This morning two of the "evicted" tenants and an ex-bailiff of the property came by appointment to discuss the situation with Mr. Tener. He asked me to attend the conference, and upon learning that I was an American, they expressed their perfect willingness that I should do so. The tenants were quiet, sturdy, intelligent-looking men. I asked one of them if he objected to telling me whether he thought the rent he had refused to pay excessive, or whether he was simply unable to pay it.

"I had the money, sir, to pay the rent," he replied; "and I wanted to pay the rent, only I wouldn't be let."

"Who wouldn't let you?" I asked.

"The people that were in with the League."

"Was your holding worth anything to you?" I asked.

"It was, indeed. Two or three years ago, I could have sold my right for a matter of £300."

"Yes," interrupted the other tenant, "and a bit before that for £600."

"Is it not worth £300 to you now?"

"No," said Mr. Tener, "for he has lost it by refusing the settlement I offered to make, and driving us into proceedings against him, and allowing his six months' equity of redemption to lapse."

"And sure, if we had it, no one would be let to buy it now, sir," said the tenant. "But it's we that hope Mr. Tener here will let us come back on the holdings—that is if we'd be protected coming back."

"Now, do you see," said Mr. Tener, "what it is you ask me to do? You ask me to make you a present outright of the property you chose foolishly to throw away, and to do this after you have put the estate to endless trouble and expense; don't you think that is asking me to do a good deal?"

The tenants look at one another, at Mr. Tener, and at me.

"You must see this," said Mr. Tener; "but I am perfectly willing now to say to you, in the presence of this gentlemen, that in spite of all, I am willing to do what you ask, and let you come back into the titles you have forfeited, for I would rather have you back on the property than strangers."

"And, indeed, we're sure you would."

"But, understand, you must pay down a year's rent and the costs you have put us to."

"Ah! sure, you wouldn't have us to pay the costs?"

"But indeed I will," responded Mr. Tener; "you mustn't for a moment suppose I will have any question about that. You brought all this trouble on yourselves, and on us; and while I am ready and willing to deal more than fairly, to deal liberally with you about the arrears, and to give you time, the costs you must pay." . . .

"And if we come back, would we be protected?"

"Of course you will have protection. But why do you want protection? Here you are, a couple of strong, grown men, with men-folk of your families. See here! Why don't you go to such an one, and such an one," naming other tenants; "you know them well. Go to them quietly, and sound them to see if they will come back on the same terms with you; form a combination to be honest and to stand by your rights, and defy and break up the other dishonest combination you go in fear of. Is it not a shame for men like you to lie down and let those fellows walk over you, and drive you out of your livelihood and homes?"

The tenants seemed to be impressed with this idea, and, after some further discussion, agreed to try what they could do in this direction. But they had another question to ask.

"And the cattle, sir? Would we get protection for the cattle? They'd be murdered else entirely."

"Of course," said Mr. Tener, "the police would endeavour to protect the cattle."

Then turning to me, he said, "That is a very reasonable question. These scoundrels, when they are afraid to tackle the men put under their ban, go about at night, and mutilate,

TORTURE, AND KILL THE POOR BEASTS.

"I remember a case," he went on, "in Roscommon, where several head of cattle mysteriously disappeared. They could be found nowhere. No trace of them could be got. But many weeks after they vanished, some lads in a field several miles away saw numbers of crows hovering over a particular spot. They went there, and there at the bottom of an abandoned coal-shaft lay the scattered remains of these lost cattle. The poor beasts had been driven blindfold over the fields and down into this pit, where with broken limbs, and maimed, they all miserably died of hunger."

"Yes," said one of the tenants, "and our cattle'd be driven into the Shannon and drowned, and washed away." . . .

The disgust which I felt and expressed at these revelations seemed to encourage the tenants. One of them said that before the evictions came off certain of the National Leaguers visited him and told him he

must resist the officers. "I consulted my sister," he said, "and she said 'Don't you be such a fool as to be doing that; we'll be ruined entirely by those rascals and rogues of the League.' And I didn't resist. But the other day I went to a priest in the trouble we were in, and what do you think he said to me? He said, why didn't you do as you were bid? then you would be helped, and he would do nothing for us."

"Did you pay over all your rent into the hands of the trustees of the League?" I asked of one of these tenants.

"Oh, I paid as much as I thought they would think I ought to pay!" he responded, with that sly twinkle of the peasant's eye one sees so often in rural France.

"Oh, I understand," I said, laughing. "But if you come to terms now with Mr. Tener here, will you get that money back again?"

"Divil a penny of it!" he replied with emphasis.

These poor fellows knew very well that, in the event of their breaking with the League, they had worse evils to dread than the houghing of their cattle. It now appears that the name of one of them is John Whyte. He has paid his rent and been restored to his farm. The consequence is that he is in no small danger, the following placard having been posted up in Woodford, on September 9th:—

"Irishmen: Need we say in the face of the desperate battle the people are making for their hearths and homes, that the time has come for every honest man, trader or otherwise, to extend a helping hand to the men in the gap. You may ask, How will that be done? The answer is plain.

"Let those who have become traitors to their neighbours and their country be shunned as if they were possessed by a devil. Let no man buy from them or sell to them. Let no man work for them. Leave them to Tener and his emergency gang. The following are a few of the greatest traitors and meanest creatures that ever walked." [Here follow the names and addresses of four men who have been guilty of paying their honest debts, instead of handing over the money to those who will not refund "divil a penny of it."] This rascally manifesto concludes thus:—"Your country calls on you to treat them as they deserve. Bravo, Woodford! Remember Tom Larkin! God save Ireland."

Yes, indeed! Every reader of these extracts may repeat those three closing words, devoutly, but not in blasphemous mockery as there used.

Here is another illustration of "Exclusive dealing":—

In November, 1885, Mr. Egan and other tenants of Mrs. Lewis, of Woodford, demanded a 50 per cent. reduction of their rents, on refusal of which an attempt was made to blow up the house of Mrs. Lewis's son and agent. All the bailiffs round about were warned to give up serving processes, and many of them were cowed into doing so. One man, however, was not cowed. This was a gallant Irish soldier, discharged with honor after the Crimean war, and known in the country as "Balaklava," because he was one of the noble six hundred who there rode into the jaws of death. His name was Finlay, and he was a Catholic. At a meeting in Woodford, Father Coen, it is said, looked significantly at Finlay and said, "No process server will be got to serve

processes for Sir Henry Burke of Marble Hill?" The words and look were thrown away on the veteran who had faced the roar of Russian guns, and in December, 1885, Finlay did his duty and served the processes given to him. From that moment he and his wife were "boycotted." His own kinsfolk dared not speak to him. His house was attacked by night. He was a doomed man. On March 3rd, 1886, he left his house—which Mr. Tener pointed out to me—to cut fuel in a wood belonging to Sir Henry Burke, at no great distance. Twice he made the journey between his house and the wood. The third time he went, and returned no more. His wife, growing uneasy at his prolonged absence, went out to look for him. She found his body riddled with bullets lying lifeless in the highway. The police who went into Woodford with the tale report the people as laughing and jeering at the agony of the widowed woman. She was with them, and, maddened by the savage conduct of these wretched creatures, she knelt down over against the house of Father Egan and called down the curse of God on him.

No coffin could be obtained for the murdered man. The priests refused to bury him, until a boycotted priest was found to do that duty. For weeks it was necessary to guard the grave. No one has been brought to justice for the crime.

We will now give an account of boycotting from a lady's point of view, our extracts being from an article in *Murray's Magazine* (May and June, 1888), "A Lady's Winter Holiday in Ireland," by Isabella L. Bird (Mrs. Bishop). The writer, being anxious to see as many sides as possible of the state of things, took a drive of about 30 miles in the county of Cork in order to visit some of the families who have been, and are, "strictly boycotted."

The McCarthy family live in a good farmhouse, with large out-buildings all in good order, and pleasant grazing land around it, 240 acres in all. This man has another farm nearer Cork and has been very thrifty and industrious. He is boycotted as a "landgrabber," but he desires it to be understood that he did not take "an evicted farm" (in which case apparently he would have recognized the justice of the sentence), but a farm which, after being the subject of litigation for some years, was duly advertised, and let to him as the highest bidder. For eighteen months he lived in peace, and then the sentence went forth. In September, 1885, late one evening, five shots were fired into his house, and since then he and his family have been completely outlawed in their neighbourhood. On knocking at the house door, Mrs. McCarthy opened it a chink. I said I had called at the suggestion of Mr.—, who I knew had rendered them some services. The door was opened a little wider, so that I had a glimpse of two comely girls at the washtub, but it was still held with one hand and knee, and no welcome was offered. Mrs. McCarthy had one arm in a sling, and her

FACE WAS CONTORTED WITH PAIN.

I expressed some sympathy with her, saying that as I had been in a London hospital for a time I might be able to suggest something that would relieve the pain. The door at once opened, and the girls left the washtub. Their mother had a very severe whitlow on one finger, which was enlarged almost to bursting; she was flushed and feverish; she had not had any sleep for three nights, and had been walking up

and down the kitchen all the previous morning, and there was no help to be had. There were neighbours all round, but not one dared to perform any neighbourly office for this suffering "leper." I asked if she could bear a short sharp pain for the relief of her hand, and she said she would bear anything she was "so nearly mad." So I opened the finger with a penknife for nearly two inches, and she did not wince, only gave a low short cry. After the contents of the finger had been drained into some hot water, and a bread poultice and a supporting sling were put on, she said she was absolutely free from pain. It was worth the whole day's expedition to see the change in this poor woman's face. Mother and daughters made me simply welcome. I was taken into a bright clean room—half parlour, half dairy, with bullet holes in the shutters and wall; tea, rich cream, and scones were provided, and the good woman said she would tell me "the state of things." . . . After taking the farm, they went on as usual for eighteen months, then came the decree in virtue of which they were to be left "*severely alone*." Their servants and labourers were compelled to leave them under threats of personal violence. Five shots were fired through their windows, since which time, two and a-half years ago, two policemen have slept in their house each night. McCarthy and his family could not attend mass; on Christmas Day all the occupants of the gallery of the chapel rose and left it as soon as they entered, and he had to be escorted home by four policemen to protect him from a mob hooting and groaning and throwing mud.

The narrative goes on to show that the tradespeople won't work for them or furnish them with supplies, because they are themselves threatened with boycotting if they should do so. They cannot sell their butter, their cattle have been boycotted at Macroom Fair, and but for the Cork Defence Union they would apparently have been crushed under the tyranny to which they have been subjected. The uncle, Dennis McCarthy, is "completely boycotted" for remaining on friendly terms with his brother. He, a very delicate man, and his wife are treated as "lepers." His wife was stoned and her clothes torn by the people when attending chapel. Shortly before the visit some of his outbuildings, his stacks, and a cart had been destroyed by incendiaries whilst the neighbours looked on. The narrative continues:—

In the County Cork I visited over twenty families of "completely boycotted" people, who are only enabled to live by being supplied with labour and the necessities of life through the agency of the Cork Defence Union. Some of these were "land-grabbers," some were people who had been unfortunate enough to be subpoenaed for the Crown, and others were guilty of friendliness or aid to the boycotted. The system has been most admirably contrived for rendering it all but impossible for men to break "the unwritten law" which has become dominant over much of Ireland.

A few days later I was at the house of Mr. ———, M.P., and in the course of conversation he said—

"I don't think there'll be more evicted farms taken."

"Why," I asked; "would the tenants be boycotted?"

"Worse than that," he answered.

"Murdered?" I asked.

"Yes; I couldn't recommend boycotting in Kerry. The people are desperate, and it would mean murder. You could not say 'there's a marked man, don't speak to him,' but what there'd be a shot fired some dark night."

Now, who has made the people desperate? The answer must be, the League and many of the priests. Mr. Parnell, when he instituted boycotting as "more Christian" than shooting, let loose the wind, and now Ireland is reaping the whirlwind. Mr. Gladstone was right when he said that the sanction of boycotting—by which alone it can be made thoroughly effective, is MURDER. He said that in May, 1882. He was then Prime Minister; he had full opportunity of knowing, and he did know, for he described the offence in terms of critical minuteness and accuracy. He has changed, and has joined the party who instituted boycotting and practise it.

We have picked out from various sources the foregoing account of what boycotting is, or was but a few months ago. How then does Mr. Gladstone make out now that boycotting is exclusive dealing? He said it was a totally different thing in 1882, and it has not improved since. If Mr. Gladstone takes any trouble to study the sources of information open to him, he must know that it is in effect what he represented it in 1882. What then, we ask, is his present position towards it, and towards its instigators? If he abets it, knowing what it really is, is he not morally responsible for all the evil it is doing? Is not Mr. Parnell responsible for the flood he has let out, even though it has overflowed, or broken through, the banks he perhaps hoped might restrain it within its legal channel? Are Mr. Parnell and Mr. Gladstone using all their influence to restrain that flood, now that, in some parts of Ireland at least, "the people are desperate, and it means murder?" It may be that private instructions have been issued to the League agents to curb in, if they can, the refractory team; but if it be so, something more is due from Mr. Gladstone at all events. He has voluntarily linked his name and reputation with that of a party whom he had denounced for years, and his fierce invectives against them, and theirs against him, are on record; they are, as it were, the rough notes from which history will be written. Even success in his present project, if it were possible, would not clear his reputation, if he neglects the opportunity of openly and publicly disavowing all sympathy with the system of boycotting, and with the Plan of Campaign, with all their attendant evils.

Whilst preparing these pages for the press, the annexed telegram has appeared in the newspapers :—

LONDON, August 27.

The house of a tenant at Woodford, County Galway, WHO HAD PAID HIS RENT, was fired in revenge, and the owner burned to death along with a servant.

LAND TENURE.



WE believe we are correct in stating that all the grievances, of which we still hear so much from the Parnellites and their Gladstonian allies, have been removed by amendments of the law ; some of them long since, others more recently. We hear, for instance, a constant repetition of the old outcry against rack-renting on the part of the landlords, but the fact is studiously concealed that no tenant can now be charged extravagant rent ; unless, indeed, it be the sub-tenants over whom the landlord has little or no control, a case of which we shall presently describe. If a tenant considered his rent excessive, he could, under the Land Act of 1881, apply to the Land Court, and this Court, the judges of which were appointed by Mr. Gladstone himself, would fix what it might consider to be a “fair rent” for him. Leaseholders were excluded under that Act, but these can now obtain the same relief, and the fair rent thus fixed cannot be raised by the landlord. Under the same Act the tenant also obtained fixity of tenure for a period of fifteen years, and he could only be evicted for non-payment of the rent which the Court had declared to be fair. Since some of these “fair rents” were thus fixed, prices of produce have continued to fall ; and rents fixed prior to 1886 became too high in some cases in consequence of such fall.

The following is now the law of the land :—All Irish tenants who had “fair rents” fixed before 1886, are, without any application on their part to any Court, to get their rents adjusted in proportion to the fall in prices ; this adjustment to be made in 1887, 1888, and 1889, at the expiration of which time it is hoped that the “dual ownership” will be abolished by the adoption of a Land Purchase Scheme. All tenants who, thinking their old rents to be fair, did not ask to have new ones fixed, can still do so in accordance with present prices.

No tenant can be evicted by his landlord, or threatened in possession by him, unless he is twelve months in arrear for his rent ; and no tenant who pays less than £100 per annum rent can be evicted until more than six months have elapsed after the time that he falls twelve months in arrear.

Provision is made for securing to the tenant full compensation for improvements made by him in erecting buildings, making fences or drains, by placing manure on the land, or reclaiming waste land.

Other provisions are made for securing compensation for his improvements to a tenant who is giving up his farm voluntarily, or he may sell his improvements to the incoming tenant. Unless proved to the contrary, all improvements are presumed to be made by the tenant.

A tenant giving up his farm voluntarily, or even if evicted, may (at any time within six months from the time that his landlord marks judgment against him) sell his tenancy to the highest bidder.

If a tenant desires to buy his holding, the Government lend him the entire purchase money. In return, he pays them 4 per cent. for 49 years, which covers both principal and interest.

If a tenant falls into arrear and becomes liable to eviction, the court can stay proceedings for any reasonable time, if the inability to pay does not arise from the tenant's own fault. The Court can give him time to pay, and let him do so by instalments.

It is scarcely possible to imagine a land law more favourable to the tenants. The last eight clauses of the foregoing abstract are due to the legislation of the present Unionist Government. Ten millions sterling have already been provided—under Lord Ashbourne's Acts—for the purpose of enabling tenants to buy their holdings under the above provisions. More than half that sum has already been applied in that way, and the plan has been found to work well, the instalments having been paid up with very few exceptions ; and the tenants becoming purchasers, drop away from the National League. This fact, which was of course anticipated, explains the hostility which the extension of Lord Ashbourne's Act met with on the part of the Parnellites and their allies. It is clear that the Home Rule agitation is not conducted in the interest of the tenants, who are mere catspaws in the transaction, and seldom if ever free agents. Both Mr. Hurlbert, the American writer, and Baron de Mandat Grancey, the French officer, from whose recent books we have made several

quotations, bring out this fact clearly, and it has an important bearing upon the whole subject. The Nationalists want Home Rule, as they call it, in order to give Ireland over into the hands of the League. The Roman Catholic hierarchy, we need scarcely say, are not seeking to further the interests of the League, but are rather using the League for their own purposes.

The tenure of land in Ireland was peculiarly complicated, and the passing of the Encumbered Estates Act, in 1849, added to the confusion, by overlooking the dual (or joint) ownership which has become part of the land system there. Mr. Gladstone at that time was still in the Tory ranks, but from what he said of that Act, in the House of Commons, in April, 1886, it would appear to have been a combined effort; Lord John Russell being then (1849) Premier of the Whig Ministry. Mr. Gladstone said:—"That memorable measure was due, not to the action of a party, but to that of a Parliament. Sir Robert Peel was hardly less responsible for it than Lord John Russell. 'We produced it' with a general, lazy, uninformed, and irreflective good intention of taking capital to Ireland. What did we do? We sold the improvements of the tenants." This was delightfully candid; but on that occasion the speaker was acting as a volunteer without responsibility. In 1870, however, he was Prime Minister when he brought in his Land Bill, which was professedly to settle for ever the Irish land question, and at the same time to do full justice to the landlords. We have mentioned this Bill before. It was ushered in with the usual sanguine anticipations, and with a moral essay on the ordinance of Providence; but even the air of sacred solemnity thus imported, failed to show the speaker that eleven years later he would have to bring in another Land Bill, in which the landlords and their rights and duties, which had had been enlarged upon in that speech, would have to give way to the exigencies of the new occasion, and that the new Land Bill would be accompanied, or immediately followed by an unusually severe Coercion Act; that Act, indeed, which was referred to in a manifesto of the League in 1885, in which the Liberal Party was charged with appealing to the electors in 1885, as in 1880, on false pretences With flagrantly violating most solemn pledges, and which continues:—"It denounced coercion, and practised a system of coercion *more brutal* than that of any previous administration—Liberal or Tory." After more of the same style of denunciation, it concludes with advice to Irish electors to vote against a party so perfidious, treacherous, etc.

Mr. Gladstone has made this transfer of votes to the Conservatives a ground for charging the Tories with having

made a compact with the Parnellites, altogether ignoring the fact that a similar transfer of the Irish vote was made to the Liberal side in 1880. Lord Beaconsfield having at that time warned the nation that, "A danger scarcely less disastrous than pestilence and famine . . . distracts that country (Ireland). A portion of the population is attempting to sever the constitutional tie which unites it to Great Britain, in that bond which has favoured the power and prosperity of both."

Lord Beaconsfield was a patriotic statesman, and, on the eve of an election, he warned the nation of its danger and of its enemies. Mr. Gladstone, on the other hand, gave the weight of his authority to the assurance that there was at that time in Ireland "an absence of crime and outrage, with a general feeling of comfort and satisfaction, such as was unknown in the previous history of that country" (Speech at Edinburgh, March 31st, 1880). He became Prime Minister; and only nine months later, Lord Hartington, then holding a seat in the Ministry, thus described the state of Ireland (January 11th, 1881):—

Under the forms of constitutional liberty the substance is disappearing. It is not, as described by some, a condition of anarchy. A law does prevail, but it is not the law of the land. For the law of the land has been substituted the law of the Land League; for the judge and the magistrate an irresponsible committee; for the police constable and the sheriff's officer—for those who work in the service of the law in the full light of day, the midnight assassin, and the ruffian who invades the humble cottage, disguised, by midnight. From this tyranny there are thousands suffering at this moment, and it is for them—not for the landlord class alone, but for hundreds of thousands who desire to gain honestly their living, but cannot do so except in fear of their lives—that we ask you to give us, not a permanent, but a temporary measure to restore the functions of liberty, though it may be by a temporary abridgment of some of the forms of the Constitution.

This was just the state of affairs which, less than a year before, Lord Beaconsfield had warned the nation of, as scarcely less disastrous than pestilence and famine; which Mr. Gladstone, who had been six years out of office and in partial retirement, met with a denial, and assurance that Ireland was exceptionally prosperous and free from crime. If this was true, how did it happen that, after only nine months of Mr. Gladstone's administration, it had fallen back into the state described by Lord Hartington? But it was not true. Lord Beaconsfield, after six years in office, would not have described the state of Ireland as dangerously bad, and thus turned all the Irish votes against him, if it had really been just the contrary. Nor would Mr. Gladstone have described it as left by his rival in a prosperous state, contrary to that rival's own admission, unless he had some purpose to serve. Would he not,

on the contrary, have inveighed in a fierce oration against the Tory Government for leaving it in that condition? What then was his reason? We can only state the facts. He secured the Irish vote, discredited his rival, and was reinstated as Prime Minister.

COERCION.

WHAT is coercion? Briefly, it is enforcement of obedience to the law. There is coercion in England, and in Scotland, and we have it in these colonies. Without it we should degenerate into a state of anarchy.

Why, then, pass Coercion Acts? Why not trust to the ordinary administration of the law? The answer to this is, that in a highly civilized community the law is based on the assumption that the great bulk of the population is law abiding, and it is only a small minority who have to be coerced into abstaining from robbery, violence, murder, etc. But when a large section of the community has entered into a conspiracy to set the law at defiance, and when, as in Ireland, they establish a system of terrorism not only to set the law at defiance themselves, but to compel others to do so; then the law has to be altered to meet the altered circumstances. When a juryman knows that his life will be in imminent danger from assassins if he gives a true verdict according to the evidence; or when a witness is placed under the alternative of committing perjury, or of being shot, or ruined under the name of boycotting, it becomes clear that in such a state of disorder the ordinary law is insufficient, and it is necessary to resort to a Coercion Act in some form to meet the necessities of the case. The outcry against coercion is a sham which shows great sympathy with the criminal, but ignores altogether the fate of his unfortunate victim. In Ireland it was found that in the case of agrarian crimes it was, in many parts of the country, impossible to obtain evidence to convict the criminals, and equally impossible, where evidence could be obtained, to secure a conviction. In some of these cases, we might probably say in many of them, the criminals are well known not only to their neighbours but to the police. It becomes necessary, then, to find a substitute for trial by jury, by extending the powers

of Police Magistrates, something on the plan of our New Zealand Resident Magistrates (though the reason is different), where one Resident Magistrate exercises the ordinary powers of two Justices, besides having some special powers in criminal cases. For the protection of witnesses, the venue can be changed, that is, the trial can be removed to another place—from a disturbed district to a more orderly one; and in one “Coercion” Act it could, in special cases, if we mistake not, be removed to England. The “Protection Act” of 1881—a much more appropriate name than “Coercion Act,” by-the-bye, for the main object was to protect peaceable subjects, coercion of the law-breakers being the means to that end—this Act empowered the Lord-Lieutenant to issue a warrant for the arrest of any person whom he might reasonably suspect of treasonable practices, or agrarian offences, and to detain such person as an unconvicted prisoner for a period not to extend beyond September 30th, 1882. It was in reference to this Bill that Lord Hartington made the speech in the House of Commons, on January 11th, 1881, the gist of which we have reprinted elsewhere. Mr. Forster, who was at that time Irish Secretary, made a very effective speech on the same occasion against the Land League. He said—

The Land League Law is supreme throughout the greater part of Ireland, and there is a real reign of terror over the whole country. No man dares to take a farm from which another man has been ejected, nor work for a man who pays his rent, or who refuses to join the League. . . . The fact is, that those who defy the existing law are safe, while those who keep it—the honest men, in short—are in danger. After all, all law rests on the power to punish its infraction. There being no such power in Ireland at the present time, I am forced to acknowledge that to a great extent the ordinary law is powerless; but the unwritten law is powerful, because punishment is sure to follow its infraction. Take away this power to punish for infraction of the unwritten law, and it will become an empty form.

* * * * *

It not unfrequently happens that the most powerful man in a particular district is a contemptible, dissolute ruffian and blackguard, who, his character being known by all his neighbours, is shunned by them all, but who nevertheless acts as the powerful and active policeman for the execution of the unwritten law. To what then are we driven? Simply to this—to take power to arrest these men and keep them in prison, in order that they may be prevented from tyrannizing over their neighbours.

Of course, in taking a firm stand against the Land League, Mr. Forster had then, as Mr. Balfour has now, to encounter the animosity of the leaders of that body in Parliament. The Irish newspapers delighted to apply to him the epithet “Buck-shot”—founded on the mistaken idea that he had ordered the use of buckshot by the Police when they had occasion to fire

upon a crowd. They altogether misunderstood Mr. Forster, who, although firm in the performance of his duty—and one part of that duty was to protect the loyalists in Ireland from the tyranny of the League,—was, as is shown throughout the correspondence in Mr. Wemyss Reid's book, kind-hearted, and indisposed for any act of severity which could be reasonably avoided. This trait is exemplified in the closing passage of the memorable speech from which we have taken a few short extracts. He said, with a depth of emphasis that

STRUCK HOME TO EVERY HEART,

This has been to me a most painful duty. I never expected that I should have to discharge it. If I had thought that this duty would devolve upon the Irish Secretary, I would never have held the office. If I could have foreseen that this would be the result of twenty years of Parliamentary life, I would have left Parliament rather than have undertaken it. But I never was more clear than I am now that it is my duty; I never was more clear that the man responsible, as I am, for the administration of the government of Ireland, ought no longer to have any part or any share in any government which does not fulfil its first duty—the protection of person and property and the security of liberty.*

At the time of the Kilmainham Treaty Mr. Forster took a decided stand, which led to his retirement from Mr. Gladstone's administration on the 2nd of May, two years after its foundation. The substance of his objections, as expressed in a letter to a colleague, was as follows :—

I understand the proposal to be—the release of Parnell and the two other M.P.'s, and, at the same time, the announcement that fresh repressive measures will be brought in without delay. Now this does not meet my objection. Either the release is unconditional, or it is not. If unconditional, I think it is, at the present moment, a surrender to the lawbreakers. If conditional, I think it is a disgraceful compromise. The statement that we will bring in a fresh repressive Bill, will not, in my opinion, enable me to say that release under either of these interpretations will be either right or safe. The release will be hailed in Ireland as the acknowledgment of Parnell's supremacy. The "No Rent" manifesto will be withdrawn, because it has served its object. There will be an agitation against the new Coercion Bill, emboldened and strengthened by the defeat of the old Bill.

After writing the letter which contained the above to one of his colleagues, whom he had been consulting, but with whose suggestion he found himself unable to agree, Mr. Forster communicated to Mr. Gladstone his determination to retire, and this was, on the same morning, communicated to the House of Commons by the Prime Minister, with the announcement of the new departure which was the cause of it. This was on Tuesday, the 2nd of May. Mr. Parnell, Mr. Dillon,

*"Life of the Right Hon. W. E. Forster," by T. Wemyss Reid, p. 482-3.

and Mr. O'Kelly were forthwith released. The two latter were in the House on the 4th, listening to Mr. Forster's statement of the reasons for his resignation. Lord Frederick Cavendish, having been appointed successor to Mr. Forster, was sitting beneath the gallery listening to the speech. On the evening of the 5th, in company with Lord Spencer, who succeeded Lord Cowper, Lord Frederick left for Dublin, and on the evening of the 6th he was, together with Mr. Burke, murdered in the Phoenix Park by a gang of secret conspirators calling themselves the "Irish Invincibles."

One of the most extraordinary features of the contest which Mr. Gladstone has raised on the Irish question since he he went over to the party led by Mr. Parnell is his

FURIOUS OPPOSITION TO COERCION.

Like so much of his conduct since he brought this question to an acute crisis, in the winter of 1885 and following spring, it seems inexplicable, when we bear in mind that he on many occasions resorted to this expedient, unwillingly, no doubt—the more so that it is unpopular—but of necessity.

After the murders in the Phoenix Park, that is, on the Tuesday following those murders,

Sir William Harcourt introduced a new Coercion Bill, which although it was laid upon the lines indicated by Forster before he retired from office, was in many respects more severe and stringent in its character than anything which he had proposed. The assassinations had at least convinced his old colleagues that he was right in his declaration that Ireland could not at that moment be governed, nor a policy of conciliation adopted towards the popular party, unless stronger powers were placed in the hands of the authorities than those granted them by the common law.*

In June, 1885, the Conservative Party came into power, and they decided not to renew the Coercion Act, which was about to expire. In bringing in his Government of Ireland Bill, on the 8th of April, 1886, Mr. Gladstone was placed in a dilemma. He wanted to use the Tories as his *bête noir* as usual, but it would have been too absurd to tell Parliament that the Tories were contemplating a Bill of Surrender to the Parnellites, so he put it in this way: he argued that it was impossible to govern Ireland as part of the United Kingdom without resort to coercion; but, of course, he could not propose coercion of the compatriots of his 86 expected allies, who held, as he supposed, the balance of power, so he put it thus:—

* T. W. Reid's "Life of W. E. Forster," p. 576.

I have shown in this brief review that, if coercion is to be the basis for legislation, we must no longer be seeking to whittle it down almost to nothing at the very first moment we begin; but we must sternly enforce it till its end has been completely attained—with what results to peace, goodwill, and freedom I do not now stop to enquire. Our spurious coercion is morally worn out. I give credit to the late Government for their conception of the fact. They must have realised it when they came to the conclusion, in 1885, that they would not propose a renewal of repressive legislation. . . . I wish I could be assured that they were fully aware of the immense historic weight of that determination. . . . Depend upon it, the effect of that decision of July can never be effaced—it will weigh, it will tell upon the fortunes both of England and of Ireland; and a return to the ordinary law, I am afraid, cannot succeed.

This was ingenious, but it was also untruthful; for his own Government had done just the same thing in 1880, after Lord Beaconsfield had warned the nation of the dangerous state of affairs in Ireland; which Mr. Gladstone himself had so promptly denied, as we have already more fully explained.

When Parliament met in January, 1886, after the general election of November, the Conservative administration being in office, Mr. Jesse Collings brought forward the well-known "three acres and a cow resolution." During the debate that ensued, Mr. Gladstone said he should reserve his own judgment, that he should listen attentively to what the hon. gentlemen opposite had to propose, etc. Will it be believed that, when he uttered these words, a summons had already been issued to his party to attend and support the resolution of Mr. Jesse Collings, the purpose and result of which was to displace the Conservatives. This fact was brought out in the House on the 9th of April following, when Lord Hartington said his right hon. friend did not wait to hear the proposals of the Conservatives, but took the earliest opportunity of ejecting them from office. Mr. Gladstone interjected the words, "after the notice," and "coercion," whereupon he was reminded that the notice to support the hostile resolution was issued on the evening previous to the notice to which his right hon. friend had just called his attention. It is thus that the vital interests of the Empire become the subject of mere parliamentary ruses!

EVICTIIONS.

WE have no intention whatever of defending all the evictions of Irish tenants which have taken place during the present century ; we do not intend to go into that question in detail. It is probable that in the majority of cases the accounts of them have in the past, as we know they have in the present, been grossly exaggerated ; and it is most difficult at the present time to obtain reliable information on account of the utter demoralization of a large part of the Nationalist Press. Let it be admitted, however, that many wrongs have been done in the past, what good can result from raking up these. We cannot recall all the circumstances attending them, nor how far there may have been faults on both sides. The more practical subject for consideration is what has been, and is being done to prevent a recurrence of wrongful evictions, or of other wrongs, in the future. We have already shown that rack-renting has been abolished by the legislation of recent years, and in respect of other matters that have caused discontent in Ireland, much more has been done for their relief by the United Parliament than could have been hoped for from a continuance of the Parliament which for eighteen years preceded the Union. An effort is now being made to enable the tenants or co-owners to become freeholders. The present Unionist Government have, by their majority, been able to carry measures for this purpose, but the opposition has come from the professed friends of the Irish people on both sides of St. George's Channel, those who do not desire to see Ireland pacified unless they can have the Government of it in their own hands. But rack-renting being abolished, how is it, it may be asked, that evictions still take place ? The Plan of Campaign still exists, and is more relentless in its tyranny than any landlord can venture to be, even if so disposed. The League, or priest-president of one of its branches, will not allow tenants to pay rent in many cases, even when they are willing and able to do so. The landlord, then, has no choice between submitting to the terms dictated by the League or evicting the tenant, which, in such cases, the law allows him to do, after a delay of twelve or eighteen months. Then he can not only evict the tenant, but after some further delay his tenant-right will be forfeited under the Irish system of joint ownership, as was explained in an extract we quoted from Mr. Hurlbert's book of his interview with two tenants on the

Portumna Estate. Those persons in the colonies who desire to arrive at the truth (notwithstanding the clouds of dust that are thrown in their eyes by the League and its partisans, or Gladstonian M.P.'s who drop in amongst us occasionally, and air their newly-found creed), to such persons we recommend the perusal of Mr. Hurlbert's "Ireland under Coercion," and "Paddy at Home," by a French naval officer, as being written by impartial witnesses of events in Ireland; and both, as being Roman Catholics, might have been expected to display some bias in favour of the side so persistently advocated by the clergy of their own Church, but we have not found such to be the case. On the cover of this little book we print a list of books we have found useful and reliable in our study of the Irish question. Some of the Gladstonian M.P.'s who saved their seats and obtained their leader's support by undergoing the operation of conversion, and making submission to him, have become very ardent supporters of his new dogma, and have published books, or magazine articles, to justify their change of faith. Sometimes we have gathered from these sources some useful facts; but, as a rule, we are inclined to discredit sudden changes of opinion, especially where it takes place under pressure, and reverses all the convert's antecedent professions and belief.

It has become the custom of late to make use of any evictions that do occur as political capital—and sometimes pecuniary capital also, when the hat is sent round to obtain contributions for the support of poor fellows who have been evicted for non-payment of rent, and who, having the money, paid it into the treasury of the League instead of into that of the landlord, perhaps under pressure of boycotting. One instance we have quoted from "Ireland under Coercion," and we do not wish to trespass unduly on books which should be read from the first page to the last. There is a very amusing account of the tricks to which Irish tenants resort to evade the law, and circumvent the agent. It will be found in the fourth chapter of "Paddy at Home." Whilst on the subject of evictions, it may be interesting to quote from a speech of Mr. Gladstone, in May, 1882, which has lately been re-published, having been read before the Special Commission in March last; especially as he was on that occasion speaking against Mr. John Dillon, and in defence of Irish landlords. Mr. Gladstone said:—

Eviction is the exercise of an undoubted legal right, which may be to the prejudice of your neighbour, which may involve the very highest moral responsibility—nay, even deep moral guilt upon the person exercising it. There may be outrages, all things considered—the persons and the facts—that may be less guilty in the sight of God than

evictions. That I do not deny; but there may be evictions which are the last, the extreme, the inevitable remedy for the establishment of those legal rights, on which the existence of society depends, against a man who deliberately, and insolently, and wilfully denies them, the man who audaciously refuses to fulfil his contract—the most equitable contract in the world,—a contract under the judicial rents recently established, with money in his pocket, perhaps loaded with benefits from the man whom he defies.

We quite concur in everything that was expressed in the above quotation; but the conclusion we have arrived at is, that at the present time, the landlords, by which we mean those who own the land—not those who are merely tenants sub-letting it—are, in the matter of rent, more sinned against than sinning; and that the operations of the League are directed more to the oppression of the landlords, by withholding their just rights, than to benefit the tenants, who are being tempted, and in many instances with success, to dishonestly repudiate their just debts, with the hope that the law has been so far paralyzed and discredited as to render the legal recovery of such claims, if not impossible, yet attended with danger to the persons engaged in enforcing the law more than to those resisting it. And those persons who contribute to the “support of evicted tenants” at the present time, are, we are convinced, in the great majority of cases, throwing away sympathy upon those whom Mr. Gladstone designated in the speech last quoted as men deliberately, insolently, and wilfully denying legal rights of the landlord, and who refuse to fulfil the most equitable contract, often with money in their pockets, and who in some cases have been loaded with benefits by the man whom they defy. Furthermore, if these evicted tenants pay their rent into the coffers of the League, they may—like the Portumna tenants mentioned by Mr. Hurlbert—have to pay it to the landlord’s agent also, to avoid the sacrifice of their equity of redemption.

To illustrate the tricks that are played upon unwary travellers, we may take from a collection of Irish extracts the following amusing incidents, which first appeared in the series of “Letters from Ireland,” which were published in the *Times* about three years ago.

THE CUNNING CELT.

The genuine Irishman is a wily creature, not unlike the Hindoo in this respect; nor is John Bull, with his downright ways and his rather thick head, a match for either of these astute nationalities when there is a game of deception on hand. Both in Ireland and in India it is not an uncommon thing to find the outward aspect of poverty without the reality, the dissimulation thus practised being due to a desire to circumvent the tax-gatherer or the landlord. Thus, lately at Gweedore, Donegal, a number of persons who were threatened with eviction crowded into the workhouse, partly to prove their poverty, and partly

to spite the landlord, on whose shoulders the chief burden of the poor rate falls. Subsequent investigation showed that nearly all these persons possessed sheep and cattle, while scarcely any were really destitute. The second instance conveys a warning to those well-meaning but inexperienced persons who try to help the poor by visiting them at their own homes. A benevolent gentleman of this sort, who had heard of the terrible distress prevailing in the West of Ireland, inspected the cottages at Gweedore. He found one family seated round a dinner of seaweed, and all the other families feeding on potatoes no bigger than marbles. It is painful to add that these tokens of distress were unreal; the visitor's arrival had been signalled from house to house, and the Barmecide feasts above described were placed accordingly on the board.

On reading the above, one is almost inclined to believe that the Irish may be, as we once saw it asserted that they are, the descendants of the Gibeonites who saved their lives by a crafty trick, as narrated in the ninth chapter of the Book of Joshua. In one of the books issued in New York by Ford, the proprietor of the *Irish World*, we met with this passage, which seems to give some support to the theory above referred to:—"Testimony and tradition show that the ancient Irish were of Phœnician origin; that they left their home in the East many centuries before Christ, and that trading relations were kept up between Ireland and Tyre, the capital of Phœnicia, until the destruction of that city by Alexander the Great." The Gibeonites occupied the country northwest of Jerusalem on the route to the port of Joppa, which lies about one hundred miles south of Tyre; but whether the Gibeonites and the Phœnicians were of the same race we do not undertake to decide, but now return to the point from which we have digressed.

The plan of subletting is common in most parts of Ireland, and instances innumerable might be cited. Moreover, the rents extracted from the sub-tenants are commonly extortionate; and from the uncertain nature of their tenure, they live in wretched huts which they can run up quickly at little cost. This is no benefit to the landlords; quite the contrary. It cannot be desirable for them to have a rabbit warren of huts, occupied by tenants, in the selection of whom they have no voice, who are presumably of the lowest class, and over whom they can practically exercise little or no control; yet to them is often attributed blame for the state of affairs which naturally results. Gladstonian members who make a trip to Ireland in the summer, perhaps under the tutelage of one of their League allies, return to Parliament well primed with the wrongs suffered by the tenants of those dreadful landlords, and quite ready to follow the "Nationalist" members in any legislation directed against the landlord class, and probably quite ignorant of the real effect such legislation is calculated to produce.

The League complains bitterly of the landlords as absentees ; yet the League is doing its utmost to drive them out of Ireland, by stirring up the animosities of the peasantry against them, or against those of them who will not tamely submit to League dictation. Then, again, the land laws of Ireland in past generations have been such as to render the landlords themselves in many cases little better than nominal owners. This arose from a system of modified entail, under which tenants in tail were allowed to encumber the property with annuities for the maintenance of their younger children, a sort of bleeding process, which if exercised by each holder in succession, would in a few generations leave nothing for the heir-at-law, who would have the responsibilities of a trustee without funds sufficient to execute the trust. Under such a state of the law, it was not to be wondered at that the tenant in tail should not only refuse abatements of rents, but should do his utmost to extract from his tenantry the maximum amount of rent which it was possible for them to pay. In laying blame on the landlords, therefore, it is necessary to consider, from the circumstances, whether it is a fault, or a misfortune, which lies at their door.

THE CHURCH OF ROME IN IRELAND.

IT has been suggested to us by friends that we should, in writing on this subject, avoid introducing the Roman Catholic Church in connection with it ; or, as it was expressed by another, we should keep out the religious question. It is, assuredly, no part of our purpose to enter upon any discussion of theological subjects, and no "religious" question of a controversial nature will be argued in these pages. With regard to the Roman Catholic Church, the case is different. The hierarchy of that Church, by several of its chief dignitaries in Ireland, as well as in other parts of the Empire, and by a large number of its priests, has made the Irish question a political one. We find them everywhere among the most prominent of its advocates on the Nationalist side. When the Pope issued his manifesto against boycotting and the Plan of Campaign it was received by the Nationalists, including many ecclesiastics, with a protest that the question was

a political one, and did not, therefore, come under the cognizance of the ecclesiastical authorities. With that we need not contend, but simply accept the admission that the League movement is a political one; but we do not admit that a political movement may not be conducted in an immoral or irreligious manner. The priest is, in Ireland, usually *ex-officio* chairman of the local branch of the League in his district. It is, therefore, out of the question to pretend to analyze the Irish question as affecting the Empire generally, and yet to ignore a most important political factor of that question, perhaps it would be correct to write "*the* most important." If any person objects to this we cannot help it. We did not bring the Roman Church into the contest, nor did we in the least desire to find her in it. But whichever way we turn there she is; and when it is published abroad that the head of that Church in Australasia makes known his advanced "aspiration for the national independence of Ireland," the matter is perfectly distinct from his functions as an ecclesiastic, and is thrown down in the arena of political controversy. Our "aspiration," is for the continued union and strength of the Empire, and we are decidedly opposed to any part of it becoming a base for hostile attacks, whatever may be the ultimate objects of the assailants, and we hold it to be the duty of all Loyalists to oppose, according to their ability, all attacks, open or sinister, aiming at the disruption of the United Kingdom.

We need not repeat Cardinal Moran's outspoken declaration about national independence of Ireland. From a Protestant Englishman's point of view, such a declaration is, and must be, thoroughly disloyal. We are aware that by a sophistry Roman Catholics, or some of them, profess to give a sort of second-hand loyalty to the Sovereign of the realm, whilst their real allegiance is given to the Pope; and where there is any collision, any case in which it must be decided whether allegiance to the Queen or to the Pope shall take precedence, they give it to the latter. Yet the same persons complain bitterly against any civil restrictions being placed upon themselves, or on any of their fellow Catholics. An English Roman Catholic, Lord Denbigh, publicly avowed in St. James' Hall, in 1867—"I am a Catholic first, and an Englishman afterwards." If a Roman Catholic believes the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ—as he is taught to believe—he is consistent in assuming that the laws emanating from Christ are superior to those emanating from any Parliament, more especially from a Protestant Parliament. The weak point in their case is, that Protestants do not admit that their Pope is the Vicar of Christ, and therefore deny that the laws of the Roman Pontiff have any such authority as that claimed for them within this

realm. We do not intend to argue the theological point on which the claim rests ; that would open up the whole discussion as between the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches. We have only to consider how far it affects the political status of Roman Catholics within the British dominions. We cannot do better than adopt the case for Rome as put by the *Tablet*, a leading Roman Catholic organ published in London. We are not aware that its dictum has been disavowed. The date was 26th July, 1851 :—

Neither in England nor in Ireland will the Roman Catholics obey the law, that is, the law of the Imperial Parliament. They have, or are likely to have, before them two things called laws, which unhappily (or happily) contradict each other. Both cannot be obeyed, and both cannot be disobeyed. One of them is the law of God ; the other is no law at all. It pretends to be an Act of Parliament ; but in the ethics of legislation it has no more force or value than a solemn enactment that the moon is made of green cheese. It is not a law, but a lie—a Parliamentary lie,—which its very utterers know to be false, and which they deliberately put forward as a falsehood, careless of contempt and ignominy, so that they can retain their hold of office. Of these two things we need hardly say which will be obeyed and which disobeyed. The law of God—that is, the Pope's command—will be, or rather has been and is being carried into effect. . . .

Without laying claim to more than the expression of our individual opinion, we may be allowed to suggest that if any persons who proclaim themselves to be foreigners, come to or reside in a friendly State, and refuse to acknowledge the laws of that State, we presume the alternative would be for them to obey, or return to the State where they say their allegiance is due. The foregoing extract from the *Tablet* is not exceptional ; we have seen quite as extravagant fulminations from other Roman Catholic publications, all founded on the same dogma, that the Pope claims not merely ecclesiastical, but political authority, even in the British dominions. As regards the practice and teaching of their religious doctrines, properly so called, we are not aware that Roman Catholics are under any disabilities which do not equally affect the people belonging to all other religions, and like these, they are required to be loyal to the Queen, and obedient to the Government. The penal laws, so much complained of in Ireland, were intended to restrain the effects of what no Protestant State could tolerate when carried into practice, as it was in Ireland on various occasions. There are, however, varying degrees of loyalty and of disloyalty among Roman Catholics. How do they decide on the limits of the Pope's authority. If they believe that he is the Vicar of Christ, where do they draw the line of his authority ? For when the Pope and his "Congregation of the Holy Office" pronounced boycotting sinful, were there not many priests and higher ecclesiastics in

Ireland who argued that the Pope had been misled, and that he was dealing with a political question alone, which was beyond his jurisdiction. A strange thing surely, if the Almighty should have appointed a deputy on earth, who was to be above all kings, and yet who should be liable to mistake as to whether boycotting was within or beyond his jurisdiction. The Pope's decree was, however, in accordance with the teaching of

THE LATE CARDINAL CULLEN,

who on several occasions emphatically condemned the Fenian and other societies. Of the first he wrote, so far back as May, 1870, that—

Many of their leaders were men without principle or religion, and that, to carry out their reckless projects, they have driven their unsuspecting followers into most foolish undertakings, and exposed them to the greatest dangers. They have displayed neither wisdom nor courage; and so far from rendering services to their country, and promoting its prosperity and its liberties, they have obstructed every useful improvement; and have brought on the country, and on the peaceful inhabitants, the evil of coercive and exceptional legislation. Of course, there was not a shadow of hope for the success of this party; but had it prevailed, or had the masses of the people joined in its undertakings, we should have had nothing but confusion, anarchy, and despotism, and our poor country would have been overwhelmed with unheard of calamities.

Again, in a pastoral letter to his clergy, at Christmas, 1877, he condemned in equally strong terms the Fenians, the Skirmishing Society, and the Clan-na-Gael Association, "which wicked men sometimes encourage in Ireland, for the vile purpose of making money by selling those whom they have seduced, thus bringing ruin on their victims."

Dr. McCabe, who became Archbishop of Dublin on the death of Cardinal Cullen; the Archbishop of Tuam, known as John of Tuam; Dr. Nulty, Bishop of Meath, and others, denounced outrages and secret conspiracies, though expressing sympathy with the agitation for Home Rule by lawful means. Dr. McCabe, in a pastoral letter to the clergy of his diocese shortly after his accession, wrote:—

Disobedience to the laws of conscience is not calculated to dispose a man to obedience to the laws of his country. Revolt against the authority of the Church may find its complement in rebellion against the State, and even war upon society itself. Nihilism and Communism may be the logical development of such dangerous teaching.

That was written about the close of 1878, and it is evident that even before that date the Roman Catholic bishops saw, and were becoming alarmed at the tendency of the League teaching. In June of the following year the Archbishop of

Tuam sent a letter to the *Freeman's Journal*, in which he made it clear that, although he did not love the British connexion, still less did he love the leading of the League, and the weakening of the influence of his Church among the Irish lower class, as the following extracts will show :—

Of the sympathy of the Catholic clergy for the rack-rented tenantry of Ireland, and their willingness to co-operate earnestly in redressing their grievances, abundant evidence exists in Mayo as elsewhere; but night patrolling, acts and words of menace with arms in hand, the profanation of what is most sacred in religion—all the result of lawless and occult association—eminently merit the solemn condemnation of the ministers of religion, as directly tending to impiety and disorder, in church, and in society. Against such combinations, organised by a few designing men, who seek only to promote their own personal interests, the faithful clergy will not fail to raise their warning voices, and to point out to the people that unhallowed combinations lead invariably to disaster, and to the firmer riveting of the chains by which we are *unhappily bound as a subordinate people to a dominant race.*

Those whom he describes as a subordinate people, were, by the Act of Union in A.D. 1800, admitted to a perfect equality with the said dominant race, and if they do not pull together harmoniously, it must be attributed rather to such teaching as that which we have placed in italics, than to any disinclination on the part of the dominant race to work together harmoniously, if permitted to do so without yielding further concessions, which would put the dominant race in the lighter scale, instead of on an even balance. The same hankering after Home Rule—or perhaps yielding to popular clamour, by conceding an abstract proposition without defining it—has characterised the speeches and addresses of other Roman Catholic bishops in Ireland. Dr. Nulty, Bishop of Meath, for example, in a published letter addressed to his Archbishop, breaks out into anathema against the “Policy of Activity,” and warns the supporters of it of the tremendous account they will have to render if persistence in that policy shall lead to the disintegration of the—we really thought the right reverend gentleman was about to echo Mr. Gladstone in the good old days that have gone past, and we mentally filled the hiatus with the words “British Empire;” but alas, no! the mountain was in labour, but in the midst of the earthquake throes which seemed to threaten

DESTRUCTION TO THE BRITISH EMPIRE

behold the proverbial mouse alone appears! It was but the “disintegration of the Home Rule party.” That was the dread catastrophe indicated in the worthy Bishop’s peroration.

The foregoing extracts represent the attitude of that portion of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in Ireland, who are

as nearly loyal as the nature of things seems to admit of. To them, it would seem, any Protestant Government is regarded as a usurpation. To them, also, the Roman Catholic Church should be dominant everywhere, but especially in Ireland where it is the Church of the majority, and almost exclusively, of those who represent the Irish of Celtic race. They see the evidences of material prosperity of the British people, whether in England, Scotland, or in part of Ireland, but to their eyes it is the prosperity of the wicked, of those who deny that the Church of Rome is *the* Church, and the only true Church. To them Home Rule means, as it has been expressed, Rome Rule. Would they like to see Mr. Parnell, professedly a Protestant, set over them? Do they not denounce him as the associate of French infidels? What sort of happy family would that Home Rule Government be if Mr. Parnell were to get his way and become Prime Minister of Ireland?

We have given fair specimens of the action, in respect of the Home Rule agitation, of the loyal, or, at least, semi-loyal, Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in Ireland. There are others who make no secret of their disloyalty. We have already referred to the speech of Cardinal Moran in Sydney, and his aspiration "for the national independence of Ireland." We understand the meaning of this to be the severance of Ireland from the British Empire, and her becoming an independent State. If that is not the meaning, we are quite at a loss to discover any other. Here at least we have plain speaking; there is none of the sham pretence that the Nationalists want only local self-government. National independence means vastly more than local self-government. It means "to sever the last link that binds Ireland to England." It means to take about a third part of the territory of the United Kingdom and make it a Roman Catholic State. It is well we have so high an authority for contradicting those who try to delude the British public with the cry of "only local self-government." Our impression is that when this comes to be fully understood in England and Scotland, the Home Rule bubble will burst. The same spirit which resisted the Spanish Armada still exists, though it has been lulled to slumber by the quiet security we have so long enjoyed. The British public have been so persistently taught that Home Rule does not mean national independence, that we were glad to find our opinion that such is its real meaning—though not openly avowed in general, and carefully concealed in England—is supported by such a high authority in the Church of Rome.

In the Cardinal's interview with the Sydney reporter he deprecated the idea of Dr. Walsh—who is Archbishop of Dublin—being involved in any difficulty consequent on his

views on Irish national affairs. It will be as well, therefore, to inquire into

DR. WALSH'S POLITICAL ASPIRATIONS.

Here is his opinion of the Plan of Campaign, expressed in an interview with a special commissioner of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, as reported in that paper of December 1st, 1886. Being asked if he was not scandalised by the Plan of Campaign, Dr. Walsh replied :—

Well, I confess that at first I was a little startled at it. I was not only startled but grieved. But when I looked into the matter carefully my anxiety was relieved. Of course, the great difficulty (indeed, I may say the only one) was that the "Plan of Campaign" leaves it practically to the judgment of the tenant—that is to say, to the judgment of one of the parties to the contract of tenancy, to fix the terms on which that contract is to continue in force. That, no doubt, in the abstract seems at first sight a formidable difficulty; but we must look at the other side of the question. If the tenant is to be viewed merely as one of the two parties to the rent contract, in what other light are we to view the landlord? He, too, is only one of the contracting parties, and he has had the fixing of the terms of the contract long enough. It is quite clear that the tenants are not to be blamed if they claim to have their turn now.

Evidently Dr. Walsh's anxiety was easily relieved. He has nothing to say about the special Acts appointing Courts in Ireland for fixing judicial rents on a fair basis, and in every way protecting the interests of the tenants with but little regard for those who, by a pleasing fiction, are still regarded as landlords; but this is exceptional legislation, as we have explained already. It is not easy to see what grievance of the tenants still remains unredressed. If the lands of Ireland are inadequate to the support of her rural population, which seems to be the case (unless the property of the landlord is to be confiscated), the proper remedy would appear to be to give a number of the occupiers compensation for their equitable rights or vested interests in their holdings, and assist them to migrate to such parts of the British dominions as would afford them a more adequate maintenance. But here comes in that inexplicable trait in the Irish peasant's nature, that would seem to induce him to prefer semi-starvation in Ireland to even a better soil and better climate in the colonies; and politicians have to yield to such an influence as this, and be content with that which will stave off the evil, rather than attempt to surmount difficulties fenced around with a barrier of prejudice.

How different is the Englishman! This it is that makes the British race such successful colonists. The Irish take a little farm, they marry young, and they are a prolific race. As the sons grow up and marry, a portion of the little farm is

allotted to each in turn, and so it goes on ; the land will not carry an indefinite number of human beings, any more than of cattle and sheep, so the population soon begins to feel the want of food. The Irish are not equal to the English as agriculturists, and socially, if not politically, they are very conservative ; they dislike innovations, and do not take readily to improvements in agriculture or in machinery. In some parts they become packed so close that they cannot get an adequate living out of the soil. They will not emigrate until driven to it by necessity ; nor will they migrate to other parts of Ireland less densely inhabited so long as they can avoid doing so. They have no manufactures, for Ireland wants the foundations on which manufactures are to be built up—viz., coal and iron. Their resource is to cross the channel and seek work, harvesting or otherwise, in England and Scotland. We have said they have no manufactures, for what there are carried on, are mostly, if not entirely, in the hands of British immigrants or their descendants, and conducted with British capital, and the coal and the iron come also across the sea. These help, no doubt, to sustain the Irish population by means of the work provided. These enterprising British whom we have mentioned may have been born in Ireland, and so may their forefathers, but are not of the Celtic race.

Now, let us suppose, that every Englishman, Scotchman, and Welshman could be banished from Ireland ? Suppose, in fact, that the fond dream of "Ireland for the Irish" could be realised ; how long would they be the better ? With the British would go British capital and British energy. If we are to suppose the landlords to be driven out, and their lands taken from them, which is scarcely likely to happen without a fight for it, it would still be only a reprieve to the Irish for a generation or so ; they would soon multiply so as to occupy the confiscated land, and then the starving process would begin again. But, in the meantime, what about the Irish settled in England ? They may be counted by, not thousands only, but by tens, and even hundreds of thousands. England and Scotland together are much more densely inhabited than Ireland is ; therefore, if "Ireland for the Irish" is to be the new rule, it must of course apply to both sides of the Channel.

"BRITAIN FOR THE BRITISH"

would be quite as reasonable as "Ireland for the Irish ;" for if we are foreigners in Ireland, as they say we are, so would they be in Great Britain. Only when we become crowded at home, we occupy the waste lands of the earth as colonies ; whilst the Irish would turn all the available land of Ireland into potato grounds, and when food become scarce they would blame

England, as they always have done. At the time of the potato famine in 1847, it was most difficult to get the starving people to use maize-flour or meal as food.

We now quote a specimen of the political doctrines of another Irish ecclesiastic, Dr. Croke, Archbishop of Cashel. [These letters, and some preceding ones from Cardinal Cullen, Dr. Walsh, etc., together with the decree of the Pope on boycotting, etc., were republished in *Blackwood's Magazine*, for June, 1888, to which we are indebted for those we have reprinted.]

In February, 1887, some members of the National League were prosecuted for an illegal conspiracy, arising out of the "Plan of Campaign," and, of course, there was the usual appeal for money for a Defence Fund. This is how it was dealt with by the Archbishop, who wrote the following letter to the Dublin *Freeman's Journal* :—

THE PALACE,
THURLES, February 17.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE FREEMAN.

MY DEAR SIR,—I enclose £10 for the Defence Fund. But when is this style of business going to cease? I opposed the "No Rent Manifesto" six years ago, because, apart from other reasons, I thought it was inopportune, and not likely to be generally acted upon. Had a manifesto against paying taxes been issued at the time I should certainly have supported it on principle. I am in precisely the same frame of mind just now.

Our line of action as a people appears to me to be in this respect both suicidal and inconsistent. We pay taxes to a Government that uses them, not for the public good and in accordance with the declared wishes of the taxpayers, but in direct and deliberate opposition to them. We thus supply a stick to beat ourselves. We put a whip into the hands of men who use it to lash and lacerate us. This is suicidal.

In the presence of the actual state of things in Ireland just now, it is inconsistent besides. We run the Plan of Campaign against bad landlords and stop what they call their rent; and we make no move whatever against the Government that pays "horse, foot, and dragoons" for protecting them and enforcing their outrageous exactions. Our money goes to fee and feed a gang of needy and voracious lawyers, to purchase bludgeons for policemen to be used in smashing the skulls of our people; and generally for the support of a foreign garrison, or native slaves, who hate and despise everything Irish and every genuine Irishman. The policeman is pampered and paid; the patriot is persecuted. Our enforced taxes go to sustain the one; we must further freely tax ourselves to defend the other. How long, I ask, is this to be tolerated?

I remain, etc.,

(Signed) T. W. CROKE,

Archbishop of Cashel.

What will peaceful and loyal colonists think of teaching such as this? Are these the leaders to whom Great Britain is asked to hand over the government of Ireland? Priests who only profess allegiance to a foreign Pope, and who talk of British troops within the United Kingdom as a "foreign garrison!" Here is another letter from the same:—

THE PALACE,
THURLES, April 22, 1886.

DEAR SIR,—I enclose a cheque for £5, my subscription towards the Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien Memorial, which I gather from your circular is to be erected in the vicinity of St. John's Cathedral, Limerick. The three Irishmen above named, and now universally known as the Manchester Martyrs, are, I believe, fully entitled to that designation, having been wrongfully arrested, tried, and barbarously executed, for participation in an outrage of which they were not guilty, and murder, which they not only did not commit, but could not have contemplated. They went like heroes to their doom, and Ireland does well to perpetuate the memory of their chivalrous bearings on the scaffold, and their unflinching fidelity to faith and country.

I am, dear Sir,

Your faithful servant,

(Signed) T. W. CROKE,
Archbishop of Cashel.

MR. C. JOHNSON, Hon. Sec.

[From *Irish Times*, 26th April, 1886.]

Again we ask, should the government of Ireland be placed within the influence of such teachers as this. What he means by the men not being guilty, etc., we do not know, not having any record of the trial. Writing from memory, Sergeant Brett of the Police was escorting some Fenian prisoners to gaol in Manchester when the three men named in the letter attempted a rescue, and caused the death of the policeman. If we do not mistake, they tried to blow the lock off the door of the van with gunpowder. Very possibly they did not intend to kill the sergeant, but they were engaged in a felonious act, by a natural result of which the man was killed, and by the law of England those who caused his death were guilty of murder, and were rightly convicted and executed. There was no excuse for pretending that they were dealt with in any special manner. We are quite willing to believe, however, that morally they were not so guilty as are those who delude ignorant men by such grossly illegal doctrines as those contained in the foregoing letters.

About two years ago, complaints having been made at Rome respecting the encouragement given, by a section of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy, to the cruel and tyrannical pro-

ceedings adopted to give effect to the Home Rule or National League conspiracy, it was decided to send

A SPECIAL ENVOY TO IRELAND

for the purpose of making a full and careful investigation into the facts, and Monsignor Persico was deputed to perform this duty, which he seems to have done effectually, without being led astray by the influence which no doubt was brought to bear on him by many ecclesiastics who are active partisans of the League. He spent some months in Ireland, and visited each diocese. Furnished with his reports, the "Congregation of the Holy Office" was called upon to decide as to the morality of the doings of the League, and whether boycotting and the Plan of Campaign were practices of a sinful character, such as would render Roman Catholics amenable to the censure of their Church. There could be little doubt as to what the reply must be to such an appeal; and the following is the substance of the decree which resulted.

Our Holy Father, Leo XIII., fearing lest in that species of warfare which has been introduced amongst the Irish people into the contests between landlords and tenants, and which is commonly called the Plan of Campaign, and in that kind of social interdict called boycotting, arising from the same contests, the true sense of justice and charity might be perverted, ordered the Supreme Congregation of the Inquisition to submit the matter to serious and careful examination. Hence the following question was proposed to their Eminences the Cardinals of the Congregations: "Is it permissible, in the disputes between landlords and tenants, to use the means known as the Plan of Campaign and boycotting?" After long and mature deliberation their Eminences unanimously answered in the negative, and the decision was confirmed by the Holy Father on Wednesday, the 18th of the present month.

The justice of this decision will be readily seen by any one who applies his mind to consider that a rent agreed on by mutual consent cannot, without violation of a contract, be diminished at the mere will of the tenant, especially where there are tribunals appointed for settling such controversies, and reducing unjust rents within the bounds of equity, after taking into account the causes which diminish the value of land; neither can it be considered permissible that rents be extorted from tenants and deposited in the hands of unknown persons, to the detriment of the landowners.

Finally, it is contrary to justice and charity to persecute by a social interdict those who are satisfied to pay the rents they agreed to, or those who, in the exercise of their right, take vacant farms.

It will, therefore, be your lordships' duty, prudently but effectually, to advise and exhort the clergy and laity not to transgress the bounds of Christian charity and justice whilst they are striving for a remedy for their distressed condition.

This decree was dated 20th April, 1888, and signed by the Cardinal Monaco la Valetta, Secretary to the Holy Inquisition.

This decree must have fallen like a bombshell amongst the members of the so-called National League, and the priests who teach the doctrines conveyed in some of the foregoing letters, which we have republished for the benefit of colonists who are deluded by the Home Rule conspiracy ; but they promptly set to work to minimise the effect of it, by representing that it was not a religious but a political question that was involved, and that, in fact, it did not fall within the jurisdiction of the Roman Church at all. There was a great meeting in the Phoenix Park, Dublin, at which, of course, some people who hold seats in the British Parliament talked a great deal of inflammatory treason, or, as Mr. Gladstone once expressed it, "were

STEEPED TO THE LIPS IN TREASON ;"

but now he is getting used to it, and if he does not talk absolute treason himself he finds an excellent imitation sometimes, such as when he said in the House of Commons, on the 8th April, 1886, that "law is discredited in Ireland upon this ground especially—that it comes to the people of that country with a foreign aspect, and in a foreign garb." This most extraordinary statement by an English Prime Minister, in the British Parliament, and in the presence of probably a hundred Irish members, was of course loudly cheered by the Home Rule Party, and at that we cannot wonder ; but can we be surprised that upward of ninety of Mr. Gladstone's own party were stung by the insult to their loyalty and patriotism, and seceded from him from that day forth, for it was on that occasion that he brought in his Government of Ireland Bill, and thus, as it were, threw himself into the arms of the Parnellites.

Since forwarding the foregoing pages to the printer, we have searched for and found particulars of the murder committed by the so-called Manchester Martyrs. We have previously referred to that murder, as having been quoted by Mr. Gladstone as one of the events which brought the disestablishment of the Irish Church within the range of practical politics. We now take from the *Liberal Unionist* newspaper of May 1st, 1888, the following facts :—

Certain Fenian prisoners were being conducted in the prison van through the streets of Manchester. Suddenly the van was surrounded by a large number of armed men, bent upon rescuing the prisoners. Sergeant Brett, who was on guard inside the van was called upon to open the door, but refused to do so. He was then shot by a bullet from a pistol fired through the keyhole—for the purpose, it is alleged, of blowing the lock to pieces. Brett never recovered consciousness, but died in less than two hours. Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien were captured, tried, and, after a fair trial, condemned to death and executed.

If the taking of human life deserves the punishment of death at all, they had no right to expect any other fate. The blood of the murdered Brett was shed by them. They had committed the crime with their eyes open, and they deserved their punishment.

Having already given the extraordinary letter of Archbishop Croke on this murder, we now append that of a thoroughly loyal Englishman, the late John Bright, whose loss to the country is the greater at a time when even Englishmen are becoming demoralised by the baneful influence which the Home Rule agitation, and the modes of operation of the agitators, are shedding over the country.

Mr. Crossland, of Huddersfield, had written to Mr. Bright, drawing his attention to a leaflet containing a song called "God Save Ireland," sung at a meeting of the Huddersfield Junior Liberal Association, in presence of Mr. H. H. Asquith, M.P., Mr. T. D. Sullivan, a Dublin M.P., and Mr. W. Summers, Gladstonian M.P. for Huddersfield (in the chair). The writer also forwarded the local Gladstonian paper, which accused Mr. Bright of having condoned the crime at the time it was perpetrated, or urged that the guilty party should not be punished in the way in which murder is usually expiated. The following extracts give the substance of Mr. Bright's reply. After preliminary remarks, he said :—

To condone is to pardon. The crime was one of the gravest character, and in my view deserved heavy punishment; but I have always opposed the punishment of death as tending rather to create a contempt for human life than to make it more honoured and more secure. I wished, too, to avoid adding three more names to the list of the criminals who are accepted as martyrs by the revolutionary party by which Ireland was then, as it is now, cursed. . . I come now to the song to which you refer, which was sung at a meeting of Liberals on the 24th ulto. It is a song written obviously to glorify the men guilty of the Fenian outrage and murder committed in Manchester, in 1867. . . At least three members of Parliament are reported to have been present, one of whom, the member for Huddersfield, was, or is expected to be, or aspires to be, one of the whips of the present Opposition, and of the new Government which the disappointed and the hungry are so anxiously looking for.

I will not reason with the three members . . . but I may reason, not with your frantic public meeting, but with the thoughtful and moral men, who were in former days many, and who, I hope, are now not a few, among the electors of your once honoured constituency. Are they prepared to glorify the actors in the Fenian outrage of 1867? Will they join in singing the praises of the men, of whom even your editor says, "They rightly paid the penalty of the homicide of which they were guilty?"

Can the moral and thoughtful men of the Huddersfield electors rest content to be represented in Parliament by the chairman of a meeting where such a song so unpatriotic and so wicked is sung, and be silent and consenting.

To what greater depth of degradation and of ignominy can the Liberal party descend under the alliance now existing between it and the revolutionary party by which Ireland is afflicted?

Yours very truly,

JOHN BRIGHT.

THOS. P. CROSSLAND, Esq.,

Birkby Grange, Huddersfield.

Another letter which Mr. Bright addressed to Mr. Houston, of the Loyal and Patriotic Union, appears in the same paper, from which we make an extract:—

What you term the Huddersfield incident is important. It shows to what a condition a public meeting of Liberals, who are blindly following our ancient leader, are willing to descend in pursuit of their party purposes. The Manchester outrage was a direct act of war, accompanied by a foul murder in the public streets. The song which was sung at Huddersfield was written to glorify the men who committed the murder, and who went armed ready to commit the murder, if necessary for their purpose. The murderers are made heroes in the song, and are glorified, but not one word is said of Sergeant Brett, who met his sudden death in the execution of his duty. English Liberals, under the leadership and companionship of English Members of Parliament, are willing to sing to the praise of those who commit murder, but have not a word of sympathy for their own countryman, killed while courageously performing his public duty.

We give the first verse as a specimen of the song referred to in these letters:—

High upon the gallows tree
Swung the noble-hearted three,
By the vengeful tyrant stricken in their bloom;
But they met him face to face,
With the courage of their race,
And they went with souls undaunted to their doom.

It will be seen from these letters that the offence was committed in England, and the trial took place in England as a matter of course. There was no exceptional treatment whatever. It was clearly a murder under aggravated circumstances—that of a policeman in the execution of his duty. The editor of the paper from which we made these extracts, writes:—"We must not forget to add that when 'God save Ireland' was sung, it was treated by the meeting and the speakers as a national anthem—the chairman and the speakers rising and standing throughout." When Mr. Gladstone talked about the union of hearts, he did not explain, nor, it must be supposed, did he contemplate, that it could only be effected, not by raising the Irish in the scale of Christianity and civilization, but by debasing British Members of Parliament and British people, until they take part in a proceeding so disgraceful to all concerned in it.

We have omitted to mention one fact of importance. The official programme issued of the event was headed "National Liberal Song Programme." On the face of it is a picture of Mr. Gladstone, and the announcement of the time and place of meeting, and names of the speakers. The inside sheets of the programme contained three songs, one of which was "God save Ireland," of which we have reprinted the first verse. That looked like an intention on the part of one of the promoters to connect Mr. Gladstone in the popular mind, by means of his portrait, with the Fenian disloyal song within.

CONCLUSION.

BEFORE closing our subject, we may say a few words about Mr. Parnell, as we do not wish to be misunderstood in regard to our estimate of that gentleman. There are several points which we strongly object to in his conduct of the agitation which bears the mild name of Home Rule; but the fault lay rather in taking up such a cause, for, having done so, he must make use of the tools at his hand. If he had attempted to drive a coach with four unbroken horses, we might say he was doing a rash thing, but if he drove several stages and avoided a crash we should say he was a clever Jehu. We doubt if there is any man in the Parnellite party but himself who could have driven the Home Rule coach as well as he drove it, with the team that was available; he managed the reins with a firm resolute hand, and, considering the great difficulties he had to encounter, we think he showed qualities which under more favourable auspices would have ranked him as a talented statesman. If we look at the contest from the time that he became the leader of his party we find him steadily pursuing his object with no uncertainty as to his own purpose. His tendency was—resuming the metaphor—to drive over those who would not get out of his way. Then he met his great opponent, armed with power, the demigod of the multitude, wielding "the resources of civilisation," but wanting in resolution, wanting also in a clearly defined purpose; who underrated his Irish opponent, and railed at him thus:—"Mr. Parnell is a living proof that the state of things in Ireland is coming to a question between law on the one side, and sheer lawlessness on the other." And again:—

"It is a conflict for the very first and elementary principles upon which civil society is constituted. It is idle to talk of either law or order, or liberty, or religion, or civilisation, if these gentlemen are to carry through the reckless and chaotic schemes that they have devised." So it went on—threats, railing, lecturing on the one side; on the other an attitude almost contemptuous. "There was a ring," Mr. Parnell said at Wexford, "about the Premier's brave words like the whistle of a schoolboy on his way through a churchyard at night, to keep up his courage." Four days later, in the same month of October, 1881, Mr. Parnell was locked up in Kilmainham gaol, and was a prisoner for six months, when he was let out under the Kilmainham compact, which was, in fact, an alliance, and a victory to him. But Parnell could not use bit and bridle whilst in prison; some of the wild horses bolted, and the Phoenix Park tragedy resulted. So the wrangling went on at intervals until the dissolution of 1885, then Parnell's opponent made a despairing appeal for help against the men who were weaving their net around him, and failing to obtain a sufficient majority, he forthwith "made a complete surrender" to Mr. Parnell, and from that day has become the most infatuated of Home Rulers.

Our task draws to a close. Ireland, by the voice of its National League, and the mouthpieces of that League in the Imperial Parliament, demands Home Rule—what kind of Home Rule has not been defined. Mr. Gladstone, in 1885-6, tried to define it, but failed utterly; his scheme containing, as we have shown, all the elements of future discord. He gave out that his Bill was dead, whilst he laid it away to be used if the nation should become so deluded as to trust him again; meanwhile he declines to propound a scheme.

Ireland, by its League majority, demands Home Rule, a Parliament in Dublin with undefined powers. Ireland, by the almost unanimous voice of its Protestant population, by the bulk of the wealthy, commercial, manufacturing, and professional classes, whether Catholic or Protestant, protests against Home Rule, as it would tend to destroy such interests by taking from them the protection of the British Government, and substituting a Government composed of the conductors of the Plan of Campaign.

Ireland demands Home Rule by the voice of Fenian conspirators and dynamiters in America, who supply the League with funds to carry on the agitation for Home Rule, and to pay the salaries of those who represent them—the avowed enemies of England—in the British Parliament.

Has Ireland shown—that is, has her Parliamentary majority shown—that she has any grievances yet unredressed, which would be better redressed by a Parliament at Dublin? She has not!

Has she shown, by the same majority, that the people who constitute the League would be wiser and better legislators in Dublin than they are in Westminster? Would the iron rod of the League be less tyrannical in Ireland if the restraint of the British Government was removed, and the police of Ireland placed under those who now constitute the League? Both these questions must be emphatically answered in the negative.

We have shown, by instances quoted from writers who appear to be disinterested and trustworthy, that boycotting is a cruel tyranny, as cruel as the torture inflicted on prisoners in barbarous times; and that it has been used to enforce a system of fraud, viz., a compulsory reduction of rents to a rate below that fixed by Courts appointed expressly to adjudicate on the subject of what are fair rents, in the particular circumstances of the case. Mr. Gladstone was certainly right when he said “the sanction of boycotting, by which alone boycotting can in the long run be made thoroughly effective, is the murder which is not to be denounced.” As an illustration of this fact, we have narrated the cold-blooded murder of Finlay, one of the survivors of the world-famed charge of the Light Brigade at Balaklava. Not only was there no denunciation of the murder, but the people had become so demoralized that they actually jeered at the agony of the widow.

We have denounced emphatically Mr. Gladstone’s conduct in respect of the Irish question. It has been suggested that his eminent position should have placed him above criticism. We hold a different opinion, and we think that the political teaching of the Gladstonian school supports our view. The teaching is that the most vital questions, even that of the dismemberment of the Empire, shall be judged and decided by a majority, without reference to the capacity of those who are constituted judges in such case. Surely, then, we who can give intelligent grounds for our criticism are not to be placed on a lower level than the illiterate people who may be called upon to decide the destiny of the Empire. If this be granted, are we then to assume that Mr. Gladstone’s reputation is of greater value than the integrity of the Empire?

The Church of Rome has figured prominently in the Home Rule controversy. Cardinals and Archbishops, as well as the priesthood, have entered the political arena. Whether their teaching be righteous or treasonable, moral or immoral, can

only be judged by weighing each case according to the circumstances and evidence. The head of that Church has taken evidence, and issued a reproof to the offenders. We see no ground for cavil at his decision, and we trust it will be obeyed by those amenable to his authority.

Evictions have been rendered, by amendments in the law of land tenure, unnecessary and impracticable, except in cases where individual perverseness, or League tyranny, stand between the landlord and the occupier, and prevent settlement without resort to extreme measures.

A few words about coercion. There has been a great outcry raised about coercion, but by whom? By Mr. Gladstone and his followers! This is a clear case—if it be permissible to use a familiar but inelegant illustration—of the pot calling the kettle black. Mr. Gladstone has resorted to Coercion Acts far more severe than the present Act, or any passed by Conservative administrations. When from any cause the law is insufficient to put down crime, there are two courses to be considered; to alter the law if it be in fault, and to strengthen it if it be simply too weak. Mr. Gladstone did both, but in a half-hearted, insincere way; threatening the Parnellites one day, yielding to them the next; desiring to get rid of the Irish question somehow, but desiring also to secure the bundle of votes Mr. Parnell was able to dangle before him. The present Government is doing its utmost to settle the land question, the chronic sore which agitators would fain keep raw for their own convenience; but the land question can never be settled until coercion by the National League is suppressed. This has to be, and is now being, put down by Mr. Balfour with a firm hand. He has not Mr. Gladstone at his elbow to thwart him at critical moments, as the late Mr. Forster had.

To grant Home Rule in any form that would give a Parliament to Ireland to make laws for Ireland, would, we are convinced, be a fatal blunder. We are asked, why, when self-government answers well in other British communities? We can only say in reply that the Irish idiosyncrasy differs from that of all other nationalities. This is not altogether due to "Saxon" tyranny and misgovernment in the past, although these no doubt tended to foster and exasperate traits of character which under more pacific influences might have lain dormant, perhaps indefinitely. The Irish are a peculiarly warm-hearted race, amenable to kindness, patient under wrongs; they are proverbially brave as soldiers, for the fighting instinct is ingrained, but they must be well led. Their intense excitability is their weak point; it lays them open to the wiles of the agitator, the conspirator—indeed, of political schemers

generally ; thus they have fallen under the sway of the National League, which, if it got the government of Ireland into its hands by Mr. Gladstone's aid, would rule them with a rod of iron, of which they have had a taste in the boycotting and Plan of Campaign, both of which have fallen more heavily in proportion on the tenantry, whom they were professedly designed to protect, than upon the landlords, whom they were designed to destroy, or drive away.

The people of the United States blame the English people, and the British Government, on account of the annoyance of the Irish question, which is reacting upon them. They say, give Ireland Home Rule, or whatever will keep her quiet, or to that effect. England might respond in this way : We did not ask the States to give asylum to disaffected Irish. They were willing, for many years, to receive a supply of labourers, who were useful in bringing the vast territory of the States into cultivation, and in the towns also, which afforded an almost unlimited field for employment of labour. If the States had protested, they had the right and the power to stop Irish immigration, which must then have been diverted to British colonies, which also required labour for their development. And, the British may say further, that the States having adopted a large population of Irish who are now beyond British control, they have also assumed the responsibility of governing their own citizens ; and if the Irish in America make their adopted country a base of operations for secret societies, or societies which are openly represented in their own newspapers as plotting against England, it raises the question whether it is not the law of the States, or some defect in their Constitution, which requires amendment ; and, if so, why should Home Rule in Ireland cure an evil which has its seat and its base of operations in America. The people of the United States are very jealous—and reasonably so—of any interference by foreigners in their political affairs. They made a great outcry recently when the British Ambassador was entrapped, by a political trick, into expressing in a private letter a preference for one Presidential candidate over the other. Yet they have done much more than this themselves. Because Mr. Gladstone is now the favourite with the Irish in the States, who have a large number of votes, some of the State Governments do not hesitate to interfere in the affairs of Great Britain in the most open manner. From the *Auckland Star*, of August 27th of this year, we cut a paragraph stating that Mr. Gladstone had received an address from the State of Minnesota, signed by the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Secretary of State, and several other principal State officials, as well as the Senate, and, with two exceptions, the members of the House of Representatives ;

the purport of which address was to laud Mr. Gladstone's present Irish policy. The same notification added that a similar memorial had been received from Wisconsin and New York. No doubt these memorialists would be glad to get free of the Irish agitation in the States if they could do so, at any cost to England ; but we do not see that the Americans would get rid of the Irish they are so anxious to please, nor do we think that the state of affairs in Ireland would be improved by granting Home Rule ; we should anticipate quite the contrary result.

The Government and majority of the people of the United Kingdom do not think it safe to grant Home Rule to Ireland for the reasons we have set forth at length, but which may be briefly summarised thus :—(1) That it would be giving the Government of Ireland into the hands of the men who are responsible for boycotting and the Plan of Campaign. (2) That it would be giving the loyal minority into the power of those men who have by the said means endeavoured to ruin the landlords, and have grievously oppressed many of the tenants. (3) That the avowed object of many Home Rulers in the United Kingdom, and of those who provide the funds from America, is separation, which—the government of Ireland being in the hands of the seceders—could only be prevented by civil war. (4) That the national independence of Ireland is the avowed object of men of high position in the Roman Catholic Church, and of their subordinates and others who are active propagandists of the Home Rule dogma ; and there is good reason to believe they aim at the establishment of a Roman Catholic State Church to predominate in Ireland. (5) A Parliament for Ireland such as Mr. Gladstone proposed could only lead to further agitation, with Great Britain placed at a disadvantage, having given up the reins of government in that island to her opponents. If she allowed secession as an alternative to civil war, or if she yielded a Sovereign Parliament to Ireland, with the Crown as the sole link between the two kingdoms, it would lower and weaken her position in respect of all the colonies or states which constitute the British Empire, and involve some great and speculative change in the British Constitution.

Foreign and jealous nations would hail with joy the secession of Ireland ; they would regard it as the first step towards the deposition of the rival whose wealth and power they envy.

And why this political earthquake of which Ireland is the centre, but which, forsooth, must shake the British Empire from Ireland to the antipodes ? It is because some three and a-half millions of people in Ireland are dissatisfied with being placed in a position of equality with the most progressive race

on earth? Is the Parliament of the British Empire, in which they have a very full share of representation, not good enough for those exalted statesmen whom they send to Westminster to represent them? Have they displayed in Ireland such predominance of energy, of skill, of commercial-acumen, over the men of English or of Scottish origin who have settled there?

We cannot bring our work to a close without a few words of apology for, and an explanation of, the large number of quotations we have made use of. Writing at this end of the world, it is obvious that we must be indebted to others for the facts of our narrative, and we have collected these diligently from a great variety of sources for some years past. It was no part of our purpose to adopt the work of others, and pass it off as our own, therefore we have been careful to indicate the sources of our information; but where the limits of our space rendered it necessary to condense the substance of what others have expressed more fully, we have re-written such passages, referring the reader to the original, for we could not vie with the picturesque style which gives such a charm to the writings of men of literary reputation, such as Mr. Froude and Mr. Justin McCarthy. There is another reason why we have quoted so many passages verbatim. Our object has been to lay the facts bearing on the Irish question before our readers, not on the authority of an old colonist writing thousands of miles from the scene, and without a personal visit to Ireland; but rather to let the actors and witnesses on whom we rely speak, as it were, in their own words. Take, for instance, the speech of Sir Robert Peel on page 24. We could have gathered the dry facts and put them together in our own words, but the statement of the deceased statesman will be received as authoritative, whilst that of a writer, unknown beyond a limited sphere, would carry little more weight than if it were anonymous.

We have placed on the cover of this little treatise a list of such books as we have found useful in our study of the subject. Others we have read but do not feel called upon to recommend; especially such as appear to be written to prop up a weak case, or to excuse a political conversion.

After all, there is, with all their faults, very much to admire in the Irish race; and we cannot rise from our work without a sigh of regret that the efforts of Mr. Pitt for their thorough incorporation with the British nation have been crowned with so little success, yet we are firmly convinced that the Home Rule panacea would produce more evils than it would cure.

England's Case Against Home Rule.

By PROFESSOR A. V. DICEY, B.C.L. 1 vol., price 7s. 6d. London: John Murray.

Why England Maintains the Union.

By PROFESSOR A. V. DICEY, B.C.L. A popular rendering of the above. Price 1s. London: John Murray.

Letters on Unionist Delusions.

By PROFESSOR A. V. DICEY, B.C.L. 1 vol., cloth, price 2s. 6d. Macmillan & Co.

Ireland under Coercion: The Diary of an American.

By WILLIAM HENRY HURLBERT. 2 vols., cloth, price 15s. Edinburgh: David Douglas.

Also, same publisher, cheap edition of the above in 1 vol. complete, paper cover, 1s. net.

Paddy at Home (Chez Paddy).

By the BARON E. DEMANDAT-GRANCEY; Translated by A. P. MORTON. In 1 vol., cloth, price 2s.; paper, 1s. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited.

Facts and Fictions in Irish History: A Reply to Mr. Gladstone.

By LORD BRABOURNE. Reprinted from *Blackwood's Magazine* for October and November, 1886. Price 2d. London: William Blackwood & Sons.

Mr. Gladstone: A Study.

By LOUIS J. JENNINGS, M.P. 1 vol., cloth, price 5s.

Also a popular edition of the above, enlarged, paper cover, 1s. London: William Blackwood & Sons.

The Truth About Home Rule (The Unionist Handbook).

Papers on the Irish Question by several well-known writers. Price 1s., in paper covers. London: William Blackwood & Sons.

The English in Ireland in the Eighteenth Century.

By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. 3 vols., cloth, 18s. London: Longmans, Green, & Co.

A History of Our Own Times, from the Accession of Queen Victoria to the General Election of 1880.

By JUSTIN MCCARTHY, M.P. In 4 vols., price 24s., cloth boards. Jubilee edition, 2 vols., 15s. London: Chatto & Windus.

Life of the Right Hon. W. E. Forster.

By T. WEMYSS REID. In 1 vol., cloth boards, price 10s. 6d. London: Chapman & Hall, Limited.